J 1.57: 981

U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20531

ORIGINAL

Second Annual Report of the Justice System Improvement Act Agencies

COMPLETED
40

Bureau of Justice Statistics

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

National Institute of Justice

Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Second Annual Report of the Justice System Improvement Act Agencies

Fiscal Year 1981

Bureau of Justice Statistics

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

National Institute of Justice

Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20531

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

We have the honor to transmit herewith the Second Annual Report of the Justice System Improvement Act Agencies, that is, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, which describes their programs and activities during fiscal year 1981.

The Act, which took effect on December 27, 1979, restructured the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), creating the four independent Agencies within the Department of Justice under the authority of the Attorney General to help State and local governments improve the quality of their criminal justice systems, to conduct research in criminal justice, and to compile and disseminate criminal justice statistics. On December 8, 1980, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, which had been a part of LEAA, also was made an independent Agency within the Department. The two statutes significantly changed the manner in which the Federal government provides financial and technical aid to State, county, and municipal governments.

We thank each of the Criminal Justice Councils for their continued cooperation and assistance in preparing this Report.

Benjamin H. Renshaw
Acting Director
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Robert F. Diegelman
Acting Director
Office of Justice Assistance,
Research, and Statistics

James Underwood
Acting Director
National Institute of Justice

Charles A. Lauer
Acting Director
Office of Juvenile Justice
and Delinquency Prevention

George H. Bohlinger
Acting Administrator
Law Enforcement Assistance
Administration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

The Justice System Improvement Act 1

Budget 2

Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics 3

- Office of General Counsel 3
- Office of Civil Rights Compliance 3
- Office of Public Information 4
- Office of Equal Employment Opportunity 4
- Office of Planning and Management 4
- Office of the Comptroller 4
- Office of Operations Support 5
- Office of Audit and Investigation 5
- Office of Congressional Liaison 5

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration 6

- Office of Criminal Justice Programs 6
- Office of Community Anti-Crime Programs 9
- Formula Grant Program 10

National Institute of Justice 16

Bureau of Justice Statistics 20

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention 23

Appendix 31

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

The first substantial Federal aid to the State and local criminal justice systems was made possible through the creation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in 1968. LEAA also established a research program and a statistical program, which are now operated by the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The Justice System Improvement Act, which took effect during fiscal year 1980, left LEAA responsible for the administration of the State and local aid program as well as administering the public safety officers' death benefits program, and providing financial and technical assistance to community-oriented anticrime programs.

LEAA awards grants to support improvements in all parts of the criminal justice system—police, prosecutors, courts, probation, parole, corrections, and juvenile justice agencies. It sponsors comprehensive State planning to improve criminal justice and fosters new approaches to specific nationwide problems such as organized crime, arson, and drug abuse.

The National Institute of Justice conducts research to increase knowledge about criminal behavior and criminal justice operations and evaluates the effectiveness of various criminal justice programs.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics develops reliable statistics on crime victims, offenders, and criminal justice system operations.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention administers a wide range of programs to assist State and local governments meet the needs of young people. Its National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention conducts research to determine the most efficient ways to prevent delinquency and to help youths lead more productive lives.

THE JUSTICE SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT ACT

The Justice System Improvement Act was enacted on December 27, 1979, to reauthorize and restructure the Department of Justice's program to improve the administration of State and local criminal justice. The Act created four agencies: the Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics (OJARS); the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA); the National Institute of Justice (NIJ); and the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). The Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1980, enacted on December 8, 1980, reauthorized the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and established it as another separate agency within the JSIA structure. Each of these agencies operates under the general authority of the Attorney General. OJARS, LEAA, NIJ, and BJS are authorized through fiscal year 1983. OJJDP is authorized through fiscal year 1984.

The maximum authorized appropriation for each year is $25 million each for NIJ, BJS, and LEAA's Community Anticrime Program, and $750 million for other LEAA programs. At least 19.15 percent of the appropriated funds must be used for juvenile delinquency programs. This amount is in addition to the $200 million per year maximum appropriation authorized specifically for OJJDP. Such sums as are necessary are also authorized for the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act, under which LEAA provides a $50,000 benefit to the survivors of public safety officers killed as the result of personal injury sustained in the line of duty.

(On December 30, 1981, that is, after the end of fiscal year 1981, the Department of Justice announced that it would terminate LEAA as of April 15, 1982, and that all continuing LEAA programs would be transferred to OJARS. The total LEAA appropriation from 1969 through 1980 was $7.7 million. The LEAA programs to be continued are Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime, "Sting," the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and the regional organized crime intelligence centers.)

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

BUDGET

The total budget for the five Justice System Improvement Act Agencies for fiscal year 1981 was $159.4 million, compared to $486.5 million for fiscal year 1980, $646.5 million in 1979, $647.2 million in 1978, and $753 million in 1977.

The individual appropriations for 1981 (in millions of dollars) were as follows:

Juvenile justice formula grants	$61,791
Criminal justice formula grants (Part D)	...
National priority grants program (Part E)	...
General criminal justice grants program (Part F)	...
Training:	
Educational development	...
Prosecutor training	...
General criminal justice training	...
Subtotal, Training	...
Crime prevention programs	...
Juvenile justice programs:	
Special emphasis	20,278
Juvenile justice institute	11,000
Technical assistance	3,000
Concentration of Federal efforts	1,000
Subtotal, Juvenile justice programs	35,278
Public safety officers' benefits program	12,500
Executive direction and control, OJJDP	2,535
Administrative services, OJARS/LEAA	12,140
Executive direction and control, LEAA	...
Subtotal, Law Enforcement Assistance Appropriation	124,244
Research, evaluation, and demonstration programs	18,045
Justice statistical programs	12,742
Executive direction and control, NIJ	2,996
Executive direction and control, BJS	1,370
Subtotal, Research and Statistics Appropriation	35,153
Total	**$159,397**

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

OFFICE OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH, AND STATISTICS

The Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics is responsible for coordinating the activities of LEAA, NIJ, BJS, and OJJDP and providing the staff support for these agencies through the various offices described below.

During the year, the Office has been planning for and coordinating the termination of the criminal justice assistance programs. Reduced appropriations have made the controlled phaseout of the LEAA program necessary, and the Office has worked to assure that a planned, orderly phase-down of program activities occurs. The Office maintains oversight responsibility to assure that awarded Federal funds have been spent appropriately. In line with reduced program budgets and personnel levels across the JSIA agencies, the Office has implemented an active employee outplacement program that, together with normal attrition, has resulted in an overall 40 percent reduction in personnel during the past year. The Office remains responsible for the continuous provision of effective and responsible support services to these agencies.

The special task force the Office established to eliminate a backlog of civil rights complaints was disbanded during the year because it successfully completed its work. From a backlog of 110 cases a year ago, the task force, working in cooperation with the Office of Civil Rights Compliance, reduced the backlog to just 20 cases at the end of the fiscal year. The remainder will be handled by the permanent staff. Discrimination complaints are still being received, but at a much slower rate due to the phase-down of the assistance programs.

During the year the Office led a drive to reduce a backlog of unresolved audit reports, thereby assuring the return of misspent funds to the Government and the resolution of issues identified by Federal auditors. Involving a number of Office units, this intensive effort caused the complete elimination of a backlog that had numbered more than 100 unresolved audits. At the same time, steps were taken to make sure such a backlog cannot develop again.

The Office has continued to work closely with the Advertising Council and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency to sponsor an effort to reduce crime in America. The initiative, called the National Citizens' Crime Prevention Campaign, is being given national publicity through public service advertising on all the nation's media with the "Take A Bite Out of Crime" program that features "McGruff," the Crime Dog. The campaign is supported by the Crime Prevention Coalition, which is a group of 50 national organizations and Federal agencies and 15 State affiliates. The campaign reminds citizens that crime can be prevented by individual and collective actions and encourages people to work closely with their local law enforcement agencies on crime prevention activities.

Office of General Counsel

The Office of General Counsel provides legal counsel on all activities, including the interpretation of the many laws affecting Federal grant programs and Federal employees. The Office has the primary responsibility for drafting legislative proposals and regulations. It also actively participates in the prosecution or defense of any litigation. In addition, the Office provides advice on audit findings agency contracts, and the operation of grant programs.

During the year the Office was actively involved in the drafting, enactment, and implementation of the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1980. It also had a major role in two Court of Claims cases upholding the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration's position denying the coverage of heart attacks under the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act.

Office of Civil Rights Compliance

The Office of Civil Rights Compliance monitors compliance with the civil rights responsibilities of the recipients of criminal justice system financial assistance under the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979 and the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. This includes enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 815(c) of the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, and the Department of Justice regulations promulgated for the implementation of these statutes (28 CFR Part 42).

During the year an extensive review was conducted of the Knoxville, Tennessee, Police Department. Seven resolution agreements were negotiated and executed that were the result of previously conducted compliance reviews. Seven notices of noncompliance were issued warning of possible fund suspensions if compliance was not secured. Fund suspension was imposed in one case.

During the year 192 complaint investigations were completed. This was in part the result of the assignment of two groups of specialists who were given extensive training, both in a classroom setting and on the job, and assigned complaint investigations. A total of 8.75 workyears was contributed by professional staff in this effort. As a result, the inventory of cases decreased from 184 at the beginning of the year to 58 at the end of the year.

BEST DOCUMENT

Office of Public Information

The Office of Public Information is responsible for keeping the news media and the general public fully informed about JSIA agency activities. It responds to questions and prepares news announcements and feature stories about all agency programs of general interest.

The Office arranges news conferences and briefings to explain the details of significant research findings, statistical reports, and important new program initiatives. It also prepares speeches, briefing papers, and policy statements for JSIA Agency administrators and directors.

As the Freedom of Information Act office, it encourages the widest possible dissemination of information consistent with the law. During fiscal year 1981 the Office responded to 404 Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act requests.

The Office publishes a newsletter, "Justice Assistance News," which is distributed ten times a year.

During the past year the Office issued 28 news features on matters of national interest and 145 news releases of regional interest.

Office of Equal Employment Opportunity

The Office's responsibilities include evaluating the JSIA Agencies' personnel management policies, practices, and programs for their impact upon EEO and the development and implementation of the Agencies' Annual Affirmative Action Plan. It processes informal and formal EEO complaints of discrimination and implements the required Special Emphasis Programs.

Fiscal year 1981 activities included:

- The JSIA Agencies participated in 4 major national conferences on civil rights and equal opportunity for minorities and women.
- The Office continued to study and collect data concerning developments in the area of EEO. In addition, quarterly statistical reports on female and minority employment in relation to Agencies' goals were analyzed.
- Heritage Week activities for blacks, Hispanics, women, and Asian/Pacific Americans included a wide range of activities during each special week, i.e., educational workshops, films, displays, and receptions with ethnic displays.

Office of Planning and Management

The Office of Planning and Management provides staff support for policy development, planning, and management activities. It facilitates the coordination of these activities with NIJ, BJS, LEAA, and OJJDP by providing and receiving information, advice, and materials on program and management topics of mutual interest. The Office also serves as the principal advisor to the Director of OJARS on policy and program matters that cut across these four organizations.

During the 1981 fiscal year, the Office was responsible for the following activities:

- The direct management of an OJARS-wide audit report resolution effort that resulted in the successful resolution of more than 100 delinquent audit reports.
- It served as the principal staff to the OJARS Director for contingency planning, preparing for program phase-down, and developing reorganization options.
- It provided substantive support and material for use by the Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime.
- It cooperated with the National Criminal Justice Association to provide State Criminal Justice Councils with phase-out planning assistance, thereby helping assure accountability for Federal funds, and also to support and encourage States to establish criminal justice planning as an on-going function.
- It managed the National Citizen's Crime Prevention Campaign — "Take A Bite Out of Crime" — in partnership with the Advertising Council and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- It worked closely with the National Governor's Association to encourage the institutionalization of criminal justice system planning and coordination in State governments.
- It responded to inquiries from the General Accounting Office concerning program and management activities within the five agencies.

Office of the Comptroller

The Office of the Comptroller is the principal advisor to the Director of OJARS in matters relating to financial management. It is responsible for establishing Agency policy in fiscal management, budget planning and execution, the agencywide accounting system, the financial reporting system, Agency procurements, information systems, and grants administration. It also provides technical assistance and training to the other JSIA Agencies and grantees. It coordinates the JSIA Agencies' compliance with financial and grants management regulations and directives. The Office has six divisions: Accounting, Budget, Contracts, Financial Management and Grants Administration, Information Systems, and Policy Development and Training.

The Office of the Comptroller is responsible for providing data processing support, which includes internal, functionally-oriented systems, as well as national and State grant management information systems. These systems provide information to the 57 States and territories, the Congress, the Office of Management and Budget, the General Accounting Office, and program managers in the JSIA Agencies. The Office financed, coordinated, and monitored the development and installation of State-level management information systems whose data bases provide a wide variety of reports on current and completed grants. To date 27 States have obtained grants to implement

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

automated management information systems. Utilizing the Office program classification system, 50 States have developed the capability to track grants and contracts from initial application through final closeout. Accomplishments in this area include:

— Computer generated grantee financial reports with preprinted field and financial data entered by OJARS for the previous quarter. This document has resulted in fewer errors for the Accounting Division to resolve.

— System expansion to immediately log the receipt of such reports and quarterly progress reports.

— Computer generated letters to grantees who are delinquent in submitting their reports.

Office of Operations Support

The Office of Operations Support is responsible for directing and coordinating all activities concerning the internal and organizational support of the JSIA Agencies.

The Personnel Division provides employee services to all components of the Agencies. This includes the recruitment, selection, and placement of all employees. It also represents management in all labor-relations matters. Major activities during the year centered on the implementation of the legislative reorganization caused by the passage of the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979. These activities, along with the substantial decline in the personnel strength (from 490 in fiscal year 1980 to 317 at the end of fiscal year 1981), have resulted in increased efforts to provide innovative methods of dealing with expanding workloads while facing major resource reductions.

The Administrative Services Division is responsible for the management and provision of security, furnishings, telephone systems, equipment, maintenance, office space, mail services, and safety and health programs. In addition, the Division assists the Agency's grantees in obtaining excess Federal property. During fiscal year 1981, grantees obtained property originally costing $254,626 at a reduced cost of $63,656, realizing a total savings of $190,970.

Office of Audit and Investigation

The Office of Audit and Investigation is responsible for reviewing grants and contracts awarded by the JSIA Agencies. It investigates alleged irregularities, conducts special inquiries which it coordinates with other Federal and State investigating agencies, and provides training and technical assistance to State and local audit agencies. The Office also is responsible for the Federal audits of 57 State criminal justice planning agencies and approximately 100 nongovernmental units. In addition the Office coordinates the audits of contracts and grants performed by other Federal and State audit agencies of Agency activities.

During the middle of fiscal year 1981 the Office was transferred to the Justice Management Division, the administrative arm of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Office of Congressional Liaison

The Office of Congressional Liaison is responsible for maintaining effective communications with the Congress and for providing general guidance in intergovernmental affairs.

The Office performs liaison activities with congressional leaders, committees, and with individual members of the Congress on legislative matters affecting the JSIA Agencies and the criminal justice community. It is responsible for the review of proposed legislation affecting criminal justice and for the preparation of statements for officials of the JSIA Agencies testifying at congressional hearings.

It retains a close working relationship with significant national organizations interested in the criminal justice system, particularly concerning mutual legislative interests.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

The Congress created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in 1968 to provide Federal financial, technical, and research support to improve State and local criminal justice systems. Subsequent amendments expanded LEAA's responsibilities by including programs to improve juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, assist community-oriented anticrime programs, and administer the public safety officers' death benefits program.

LEAA has awarded grants to all components of the criminal justice system—police, courts, prosecutors, probation, parole, corrections, public defenders, and juvenile justice agencies. It has sponsored comprehensive State planning for more efficient criminal justice administration and financed new approaches to such specific nationwide problems as arson, victim-witness needs, organized crime, drug abuse, and police and corrections accreditation. In addition, LEAA has financed higher education for criminal justice personnel, sponsored improved criminal justice curricula in colleges and universities, and provided specialized training for criminal justice officials at the State and local levels.

With the enactment of the Justice System Improvement Act in December 1979, LEAA was subsumed organizationally under the newly created Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics. Shortly thereafter, in the spring of 1980, Congress voted to phase out the LEAA budget in response to a measure proposed by the President. Since then no new funding has been appropriated for the Agency, and all administrative and programmatic activities have been devoted to achieving an orderly phaseout of the LEAA program. The phaseout continued throughout fiscal year 1981, and on December 30, 1981, that is, subsequent to the close of the fiscal year, the Department of Justice announced that LEAA would be terminated on April 15, 1982.

LEAA is comprised of two program offices: the Office of Criminal Justice Programs and the Office of Community Anti-Crime Programs. Certain priority projects were funded, with the concurrence of the Deputy Attorney General, by both these entities during 1981 using reversionary funds and 1980 carry-over funds. The awards were made with two goals in mind.

- To bring particularly promising categorical projects to a point where they could be institutionalized and responsibility for their continuation assumed locally.
- To assist the 57 Criminal Justice Councils in meeting all the management and administrative responsibilities attendant on the close-out of a major Federal grant-in-aid program.

A summary of the programs that were active during 1981 is presented in the following paragraphs.

Office of Criminal Justice Programs

The Office of Criminal Justice Programs is the largest unit in LEAA and is the principal contact for State and local criminal justice agencies. It awards, monitors, evaluates, and terminates all planning and block action grants and manages most of LEAA's discretionary grants and technical assistance activities. It is composed of three criminal justice assistance divisions, six program divisions, an arson desk, a staff unit, and the Public Safety Officer's Benefits Program.

Criminal Justice Assistance Divisions

The three Criminal Justice Assistance Divisions are responsible for management of the LEAA block grant program. Each division services a particular geographic region of the country—Northeast, South Central, and Western.

Program Divisions and Arson Desk

The six program divisions—Enforcement-Criminal Conspiracies, Adjudication, Corrections, Correctional Standards Accreditation Program Management Team, Special Programs, and Manpower, Training and Evaluation as well as the LEAA Arson Desk are responsible for administering the Discretionary Grant Program. They make project grants for the purpose of testing, implementing, and evaluating programs at the national, State, and local levels.

Enforcement Division

The Enforcement Division funds projects for the deterrence, detection, investigation, and control of crime by State and local law enforcement agencies. The objective of these projects is to improve and strengthen law enforcement capability through specialized technical assistance to operating agencies, training for management and line personnel, research to develop new information and techniques, and operational programs to test, demonstrate, and market enforcement technology.

The **Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies** was formed in December 1979. The goals of the program are to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of law enforcement service delivery, increase citizen and individual officer confidence in law enforcement standards

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

and practices, and effect a greater standardization of administrative and operational practices.

Four law enforcement associations work together to provide a staff of law enforcement professionals for the commission: the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the National Sheriffs' Association, and the Police Executive Research Forum. They review the work of previous commissions and the products of 10 years' work by LEAA, researching contemporary management methodologies and recommending standards for law enforcement administration, operations, and support services.

Upon the completion of the standards, the process of accreditation will be developed and instituted. The commission will act as an independent, nonprofit corporation administering the process and then conferring accreditation status on those agencies that have met the standards.

The **Integrated Criminal Apprehension Program** (ICAP) is a national priority program that provides grants and assistance to more than 40 municipal police departments throughout the United States to help them develop and install a comprehensive management and operations system to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of police operations. The program institutionalizes improvements in computer-based resource allocation, planning, and assignment; the upgrading of analytic capabilities of police managers and operational units; the use of crime and disorder analysis; the management of calls-for-service workload by the adoption of alternative responses to selected calls; the development and implementation of directed patrol strategies and tactics; the targeting of information and resources on career criminal populations; and innovations in crime prevention programs.

The **Police Technical Assistance Project** provides support and assistance in the form of consultation, publications, workshops, and conferences to police departments participating in the ICAP, the Managing Criminal Investigations Program, and the Criminal Conspiracies Program as well as to the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies.

The **Managing Criminal Investigations Program** provides grants and technical assistance support to municipal and State police agencies to enable them to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal investigation process in their local jurisdictions. The program seeks to increase the ratio of convictions to arrests by changing the manner in which patrol units respond to and process a criminal investigation, assisting patrol and investigation supervisors in making more rational allocation of resources in continuing the investigation of certain types of crimes, and improving the process of the follow-up investigation and the preparation of criminal cases for prosecution.

The Police Management Training Program funds courses on Hazardous Devices Training, Management Seminars in Terrorism, Special Operations and Research Staff, Federal Bureau of Investigation Bomb Data, Federal Aviation Administration Airport Security, and Citizen Security Training. To date, more than 8,000 people have been trained through this program.

The Anti-Fencing "Sting" Program is designed to disrupt the illegal redistribution system in stolen goods.

The Organized Crime and White-Collar Crime Program funds projects in intelligence development, prosecution, prevention councils, training, strike forces, corruption detection and investigation, and undercover fencing operations.

Adjudication Division

The Adjudication Division's mission is to encourage and assist the criminal justice system leadership to improve and reform the nation's court systems through its programs.

In 1975, LEAA initiated the **Career Criminal Program**, which emphasizes the expeditious prosecution of persons accused of serious violent crimes who have had previous felony convictions. Thus far, 70 jurisdictions have implemented the full program. The program utilizes early case screening, identification of career criminal defendants using selection criteria developed by the prosecuting jurisdiction, vertical prosecution (i.e. one prosecutor handles the case from acceptance to disposition), and the elimination of plea bargaining.

The **Fundamental Court Improvement Program** helps States reform their State court and State indigent defense delivery systems. Major court unification programs were undertaken with LEAA support in Alabama, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri and North Dakota.

The **Court Delay Reduction Program** has developed into a major court reform effort during the past year, with nearly 70 metropolitan and State court systems benefitting from technical assistance, demonstration grants, and training. The program helps both State trial and appellate courts improve case management. Major grants are currently active in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Alabama, and Washington, D.C. Thirty new metropolitan courts have participated in intensive regional workshops where court teams develop delay reduction plans that they will implement in their own jurisdictions.

The **Jail Overcrowding Program** assists metropolitan counties and States deal with overcrowded jails by focusing on the pretrial jail population, particularly in those institutions that are under court order to reduce their populations. Forty-five metropolitan counties and three States have been involved in this program.

The **Courts Training and Technical Assistance Program** provides training for judges, prosecutors, defenders, lawyers, and court administrators to disseminate information on advances in court organization, administrative techniques, technology applications, and substantive law reform. It also gives immediate short-term assistance to the major components of the adjudicatory process—courts, prosecution, and defense—through direct on-site consultation and through clearinghouse services. During the past year training was provided for an estimated 3,500 judges, 1,100 prosecutors, 900 defenders, 700 lawyer advocates, and 600 court administration personnel.

The **Juror Utilization and Management Program** seeks to improve jury systems and to ensure that they are more representative of the populace as a whole and less costly for taxpayers and employers. Currently nine States and three localities have received grants to apply the management techniques that were shown to be effective in an earlier LEAA research and demonstration program.

Corrections Division

The Corrections Division supports the operation and improvement of agencies and programs that provide residential and nonresidential services to pretrial detainees, inmates, probationers, parolees, and ex-offenders. Its programs include:

The **Free Venture Prison Industries Program,** which seeks to develop prison industries that will duplicate the conditions of private industry as closely as possible. The Free Venture model includes a full workweek, inmate wages based on worker output, real world productivity standards, hire and fire authority at the shop supervisor level (within the limits of due process), self-support or profit-making business operations, and post-release job placement mechanisms.

The **Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) Program,** which develops criminal justice intervention mechanisms so that eligible substance-abusing offenders can be identified, referred to community-based treatment programs, and monitored in treatment. The program is primarily a pretrial diversion mechanism; 51 percent of all clients accepted are referred at this point in the criminal justice process.

The **Treatment and Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners (TRAP) Program,** which reduces illicit drug use and related criminal activity by providing treatment and rehabilitative services for serious substance-abusing offenders while they are incarcerated in State correctional institutions and on subsequent parole release.

The **Medical Care-Health Services Program,** which was created to transfer the technology and expertise developed under earlier LEAA grants to additional jails in other States. During fiscal year 1981, a continuation grant was made to the American Medical Association, which has selected 23 State medical societies to participate in this year's program.

Each of the participating medical societies in turn selected a minimum of 10 jails in its area. This program served 230 jails and reached several hundred thousand inmates during the year.

The **Legal Services Program,** which demonstrates effective and economical ways to ensure that incarcerated offenders have access to legal services and to the courts. Program activities include hiring staff, locating office space, acquiring equipment, and coordinating with various criminal justice agencies. Based on performance to date, it is estimated that 90 percent of requests for assistance are resolved administratively as a result of this program.

The **Community Service Restitution Program,** which tests alternatives to typical correctional processing of selected offenders to lower costs (as compared with the cost of incarceration) and provide services to the community while at the same time benefiting the offender.

The **Correctional Facilities Energy Conservation Program,** which was created to reduce energy consumption in jails, prisons, and correctional facilities through a $175,000 technical assistance grant coupled with an Interagency Agreement with the Department of Energy. LEAA initiated an effort to provide self-help support to corrections managers in their audit of energy consumption, develop plans to reduce consumption, and implement facility retrofit measures and conservation methods.

Correctional Standards Accreditation Program Management Team

The Correctional Standards Accreditation Program Management Team develops, demonstrates, and implements correctional standards. Eleven States were selected to serve as demonstration sites for systemwide accreditation. The purpose of these projects is to demonstrate and evaluate the accreditation process as a means of implementing correctional standards. The American Correctional Association has completed the revision of all standards

Special Programs Division

The Special Programs Division is responsible for the development and funding of multidisciplinary, national-scope projects that support all components of the criminal justice system. During the past year the Division's activities focused on victim-witness assistance, domestic violence, and Indian justice.

The **National Victim-Witness Strategy Program** develops, expands, and improves services to crime victims and witnesses through the creation or support of centralized structures or networks of victim-witness services and the mobilization of existing nongovernmental groups and organizations. Grants were awarded to establish statewide networks and national organizations to stimulate development of victim-witness programs at the State and local level.

The **Integrated Police-Prosecution Program** supports projects to improve the treatment of victims and witnesses by both the police and prosecutors, thereby increasing the rate of successful prosecutions. The program integrates and merges victim-witness activities to provide a unified approach to the handling of victims and witnesses.

The **Family Violence Program** seeks to reduce and prevent violence between members of the same family or between persons who live together in the same household. It includes spouse abuse, child abuse, the sexual abuse of children, the abuse of parents by children, and other forms of intrafamily violence. To date 35 local projects have had direct contact with more than 8,000 adult victims and approximately 2,000 children. Through these projects approximately 5,000 days of shelter were provided as well as 6,000 counseling interviews.

The **Indian Criminal Justice Program** funds projects to improve the quality of law enforcement and criminal justice on Indian reservations. Projects address all areas of the justice system—prevention, enforcement, adjudication, corrections, and juvenile justice.

Manpower, Training, and Evaluation Division

Criminal Justice Manpower Planning. Project grantees at Michigan State University, the University of South Florida, and Sam Houston State University have worked cooperatively to adapt the methods of comprehensive manpower planning that have been successful in industry to law enforcement and corrections.

Police Recruitment, Selection, and Training. The California and Florida Police Standards and Training Commissions were supported in developments related to entry-

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

level requirements. Florida conducted a statewide patrol officer job analysis to serve as a model for other States. California developed a comprehensive battery of tests for applicants, including reading and writing skills and physical performance.

The National Law Enforcement Explorers Program of the Boy Scouts of America introduces teenagers to careers in police work and adds to their understanding of crime and criminal justice. There are 1,800 posts, each sponsored by local agencies, with 33,000 girls and boys. LEAA supports the national programming and organization coordination for this effort.

Criminal Justice Higher Education. The Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards was established by a number of professional societies under an LEAA grant to develop a concensus for university programs. Because of the impact of crime on blacks and because of the paucity of black holders of graduate degrees in the field, the Center for Minorities and Criminal Justice was established in 1981 at the State University of New York in Albany.

By year's end 21 students had received master's degrees and six were actively working toward doctorates. Nine research reports and papers that increase the knowledge of criminal justice from the minority perspective have been published. In addition, criminal justice programs have been established and strengthened with LEAA support at Atlanta University, Talladega College, and Grambling College.

Criminal Justice Training. During the year five regional criminal justice training and technical assistance centers concentrated with considerable success on the institutionalization of their programs to continue serving their areas after LEAA support is terminated. The centers are located at Florida State, Washburn, Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Northeastern, and Southern California universities. They provide training mainly in management, planning, analysis, and evaluation to State and local criminal justice officials. The instructor and trainee materials for each course have been published and are available to training institutions.

Program Review and Evaluation. The division is responsible for the evaluation design for programs and projects of the Office of Criminal Justice Programs. Division evaluation specialists review plans and counsel evaluators and, with the program managers, monitor the evaluations and assess the reports. The division also is responsible for special plans and program analyses.

Arson Unit

The Arson Control Assistance Program combines the investigatory and prosecutorial expertise of Federal criminal justice agencies with their financial and technical assistance capabilities. The objective of the program is to assist in State, regional, county, and local efforts to reduce the incidence of arson and the human and economic loss related to arson. Some 34 projects have been funded through this program.

Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program

The Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act of 1976 authorizes LEAA to pay a benefit of $50,000 to eligible survivors of State and local public safety officers found to have died as the direct and proximate result of a personal injury sustained in the line of duty. Public safety officer is defined in the Act as "a person serving a public agency at the State or local level in an official capacity, with or without compensation, as a law enforcement officer or as a fireman." Among those for whom coverage is intended are persons involved in crime and juvenile delinquency control or reduction or the enforcement of criminal laws, including police, corrections, probation, parole, and judicial officers. Paid and volunteer fire fighters are also covered.

The Act applies to deaths occurring from injuries sustained on or after September 29, 1976. During fiscal year 1981, 269 claims from 1981 and all prior years were determined to be eligible for benefit payments totaling $13.5 million.

Office of Community Anti-Crime Programs

The Office of Community Anti-Crime Programs was established by the Crime Control Act of 1976 to provide technical assistance, award grants, disseminate information, and coordinate groups in crime prevention efforts designed to mobilize communities and citizens in combating crime problems in both urban and rural America. The Office has three major programs—Community Anti-Crime, Comprehensive Crime Prevention, and the Urban Crime Prevention Programs.

Community Anti-Crime Program. During fiscal year 1981, the focus of the program was to provide technical assistance to the 120-plus grantees and other community and neighborhood groups to assist them in their program efforts to institutionalize their crime prevention programs. Regional workshops were conducted and on-site assistance was provided to locations throughout the country. Additionally, a series of publications on self-sufficiency was developed and disseminated to groups around the Nation. Emphasis also was given to assisting groups in coordinating their efforts with other community organizations and integrating them with the crime prevention operations of their local criminal justice agencies.

Comprehensive Crime Prevention Program. The 16 jurisdictions participating in the Comprehensive Crime Prevention Program have been part of a national demonstration program designed to test the effect of establishing a well-planned comprehensive approach to managing crime prevention programs in medium-sized cities. Each program integrates criminal justice and noncriminal justice resources, specifically citizens, police, private business, and local government in an effort to implement a broad range of strategies simultaneously to have a greater total effect on the prevention of crime, the reduction of fear, and the stimulation of citizen action and involvement. The principal effort during the past fiscal year has been directed toward providing technical assistance to these sites and integrating their efforts into the local criminal justice budget process.

Urban Crime Prevention Program. The Urban Crime Prevention Program was a Presidential initiative jointly

managed and administered by LEAA and ACTION. Ten awards were made during 1981 totaling $4.4 million to private nonprofit grantees in major urban areas. The goal of the program is to broaden the approach to urban crime in low and moderate income neighborhoods. The principal goals of the program are to increase neighborhood participation and problem-solving capacity and to forge a working partnership among neighborhood groups, criminal justice agencies, and other public and private organizations.

Formula Grant Program

Formula grant activities in 1981 continued the course begun in 1980, i.e. phasing out the LEAA block grant program. Support for all administrative and programmatic efforts during the year came from carry-over funds from previous years' awards and reverted funds.

The following report on the formula grant program is presented in the format followed in previous annual reports. All program activities are discussed in terms of five principal categories: prevention, enforcement, adjudication, corrections, and system support, as described below. In addition, information and statistics concerning projects having a juvenile justice or drug abuse orientation are reported on again separately in response to the particular interest in these two program areas expressed by the Congress.

Prevention includes community or official activities in support of crime and delinquency prevention. Preventive measures include both target-hardening strategies (environmental design, security measures, and public education to promote citizen cooperation in reducing criminal opportunities) and human service programs that provide community support to populations vulnerable to future criminal or delinquent activities by virtue of age, special problems, or prior contact with the system.

Enforcement includes all programs related to the detection, investigation, and control of crime and delinquency by State and local law enforcement agencies and related organizations. All functions in support of police agencies, including crime reporting, information exchange, and police management are included.

Adjudication covers all activities in support of the operations of criminal, civil, and juvenile judicial institutions from the highest appellate court to trial courts of least jurisdiction. Included are pretrial, trial, and sentencing procedures and the related functions of pre-sentencing procedures, prosecution, defense, and adjudication. Nonjudicial court administrative organizations and programs providing nonlegal services in lieu of continuing court intervention are included.

Corrections includes all Federal, State, and local agencies that provide both residential and nonresidential services to probationers, inmates, parolees, and ex-offenders. Also classified as corrections efforts are residential programs for delinquent or dependent youth and all court-ordered community and civil sanctions or placements.

System support includes activities that affect more than one or all components of the criminal or juvenile justice system. These encompass programmatic activities (such as comprehensive data systems or systemwide training efforts), activities that support the development of law and policy (legislative efforts and operations analysis), or the application of systemwide resources to special target groups, such as victims and minority groups. Accordingly, "system support" is not limited to computerized information or ADP systems.

Juvenile justice and delinquency prevention means any program activity related to juvenile delinquency prevention, control, diversion, treatment, rehabilitation, planning, education, training, and research, including drug and alcohol abuse programs, improvements in the juvenile justice system, and any program or activity for neglected, abandoned, or dependent youth and other youths who are in danger of becoming delinquent.

Drug abuse means any project or program whose primary or principal focus is drug or alcohol abuse prevention, treatment, or related activity.

The dollar amounts used in the following discussion represent expenditures and not the obligations that were reported in previous reports. This change was considered appropriate because during this end phase of the program very few obligations are being made, and expenditure data is a better index of formula grant activity.

Expenditure of Formula Grant Funds

During fiscal year 1981 a total of $51,578,512 was expended by the States on formula grant programs. The accompanying table (Table 1) analyzes this total, showing the five major components and the proportion of programs directed at juvenile justice and drug abuse.

Predictably, the largest share of funds—almost a quarter of the total—were spent for system support. State and local agencies attempted to institutionalize systemic improvements prior to the termination of the program. This category includes legislation, policy, and standards, criminal justice research, information and communications systems, citizens action groups, agency training and education, and criminal justice program planning, development and management.

The three major criminal justice program areas accounted for 60 percent of the expenditures: enforcement, 20 percent; adjudication, 21 percent; and corrections, 19 percent. Prevention programs received 16 percent of the funds.

Table 1. Expenditures by Criminal Justice Component FY 1981

Component	Amount	Percent of Funds
Prevention	$ 8,392,858	16
Enforcement	10,247,462	20
Adjudication	10,933,512	21
Corrections	9,873,976	19
System Support	12,130,754	24
Total	$51,578,512	
Juvenile Justice*	11,443,031	22
Drug Abuse*	1,343,476	3

** Included in program component figures above.*

Innovative State Projects

In this section, LEAA responds to the Congress' mandate to include in its annual report "the descriptions and number of programs and project areas, and the amounts expended therefor, which are innovative or incorporate advanced techniques and which have demonstrated promise of furthering the purposes of this title."

In collecting data for this section the following definitions were used:

- Innovative: characterizing a program or project funded or undertaken by a CJC in its State that is new to the criminal justice system, to the best of the CJC's knowledge. It does not mean new to the State or new to the CJC.
- Incorporate advanced techniques: program or project area that uses new mechanisms to reduce crime or to improve the criminal justice system.
- Demonstrated promise of furthering the purposes of this title: projects or program areas that, in addition to being innovative or having incorporated advanced techniques also have proved measurably successful in reducing crime or improving criminal justice.

Information was collected on projects ending in fiscal year 1981 that were designated by the Criminal Justice Councils as being innovative or particularly promising. States were instructed to draw on their knowledge and expertise and use their own judgment in determining whether a given project met the above criteria. They were not asked to survey all other CJC's for corroboration, but were, however, required to assure that the innovations or advanced techniques they cited did demonstrate furthering the purposes of the Act.

Overview & Summary. Criminal Justice Council's submissions identified a total of four innovative LEAA-funded projects.

Table 2. Innovations by Program Component
Numbers of Projects and Amounts Expended

Program Component	Number of Projects	Expenditures in FY 1981	Expenditures in all Previous Years*	Total
Prevention	87	$ 417,947	$ 3,350,028	$ 3,767,975
Enforcement	68	53,883	4,326,405	4,380,288
Adjudication	113	934,840	6,590,233	7,525,073
Corrections	92	223,987	4,776,152	5,000,139
System Support	51	458,418	4,100,886	4,559,304
Total	411	$2,089,075	$23,143,704	$25,232,779
Juvenile Justice**	113	611,738	5,981,446	6,593,204
Drug Abuse**	9	2,389	155,167	157,556

* *Funds expended over the history of the projects reported.*
** *Included in program component figures.*

Forty-one of the 57 jurisdictions responding reported on innovative projects. The distribution of these projects over the five criminal justice program components and the amount of funds obligated for these projects are shown in Table 2. These innovations, in order of percentage of total projects, are as follows: adjudication, 113 (27 percent); corrections, 92 (22 percent); prevention, 87 (21 percent); enforcement, 68 (17 percent); and system support, 51 (12 percent). Twenty-seven percent of these projects (113) were in the juvenile justice area, and less than 1 percent (nine projects) had a drug abuse component.

The following paragraphs summarize the types of innovative projects implemented in 1981, as described by the States.

Prevention. The 87 prevention program innovations fell into five main categories: security programs and systems, 24 projects; youth services programs, 39 projects; education and employment programs, 15 projects; community drug and alcohol treatment programs, one project; and family services programs, eight projects. More than half the projects cited (61 percent) wholly or in part were for juveniles.

Enforcement. The 68 innovative enforcement projects occurred in nine program areas: records and information, 16 projects; investigation services, 15 projects; basic police resources, nine projects; organization and management, seven projects; social services-community relations, six projects; forensic services, six projects; patrol, four projects; personnel administration, four projects; and communications, one project. Six of these projects had a juvenile justice component and two addressed drug abuse.

Adjudication. The 113 innovative adjudication projects were as follows: prosecution services, 25 projects; victim and witness assistance, 19 projects; intake and pretrial services, 17 projects; judicial administration, 16 projects; defense services, nine projects; general court services, eight projects; detention and residential supervision, seven projects; court records management and information systems, seven projects; judicial process-procedure, three projects; and community relations and court facilities, one project each.

Corrections. There were 92 innovative corrections projects in the following categories: inmate services (training, drug treatment, medical-dental services, and recreation

programs), 18 projects; facilities and facilities support services, 17 projects; parole-probation and ex-offender services, 17 projects; special residences, 13 projects; organization and management, nine projects; re-entry and restitution programs, eight projects; inmate grievance-legal rights, six projects; general corrections services, three projects; and public information, one project. Twenty-three projects had a juvenile justice component, four addressed drug abuse.

System Support. The States reported on 51 innovative system support projects: program planning-development-management-assessment, 13 projects; training and education, 10 projects; comprehensive criminal justice programs, nine projects; criminal justice research, seven projects; information and communications systems, five projects; public education, two projects; personnel, two projects, and legislation, policy, and standards, three projects. Nine projects were for juveniles.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. A total of 113 innovative projects wholly or in part for juveniles was reported in fiscal year 1980. Most of these reports were in the areas of prevention (53 projects). Corrections showed the next greatest concentration (23 projects), followed by adjudication (22 projects), system support (nine projects), and enforcement (six projects). Types of projects cited were youth services bureaus, educational programs, police social services, court-based diversion, victim services, defense services, and halfway houses.

Drug Abuse. The States reported nine innovative projects with a drug abuse component: corrections, four projects; enforcement, two projects; adjudication, one project; and two prevention projects. Most of the projects were related to treatment; two were for white-collar crime investigation and narcotics enforcement.

State Replication of Successful Projects

Replication for purposes of this report was defined as "an investment, consciously made by a State Planning Agency in its State, in a particular program or project area, based on a success experienced elsewhere." The States were asked to report expenditures made for such replications during fiscal year 1981. In addition, they were asked to indicate how much money had been expended in all previous years for projects identified in fiscal year 1981 as replications.

Replications data submitted for 1981 are summarized in Table 3. The total number of projects, 3,344, is down 11 percent from the 1980 total of 4,254 projects. Expenditures are down 61 percent—$10,840,416 in 1981 compared to $27,839,458 in 1980.

There was considerable change during the year in the priority and emphasis placed on the major criminal justice components as reflected in the relative numbers of projects funded and the dollar amounts expended (See Table 4). In terms of numbers of projects, enforcement dropped in the ranking from first to second position, and from first to fourth position in terms of expenditures. Adjudication projects rose from second to first position in both rankings. Corrections projects retained the same third place ranking for both numbers of projects and funding level. Prevention remained in fourth place in numbers of projects and dropped to fifth place (last) in level of funding. System support remained at the same fifth place ranking in number of projects, but rose dramatically in the expenditures rankings from fifth place to second.

The number of juvenile justice projects, as a percentage of total projects, increased by two points in 1981; funding level remained the same at 20 percent. The number of drug abuse projects decreased from 4 percent to 2 percent and funding level dropped from 3 percent to 2 percent.

Prevention. Replicated prevention projects centered on the following types of programs: security programs and systems, 37 percent; youth services programs, 34 percent; education and employment programs, 18 percent; family services programs, 6 percent; and community alcohol and drug problems, 4 percent.

Enforcement. The 907 enforcement replications were as follows: basic police resources, 24 percent; social services-

Table 3. Replications by Program Component
Numbers of Projects and Amounts Expended

Program Component	Number of Projects	Expenditures in FY 1981	Expenditures in all Previous Years*	Total
Prevention	558	$ 1,427,314	$13,897,203	$15,324,517
Enforcement	907	1,936,991	25,345,243	27,282,234
Adjudication	944	3,003,723	28,552,912	31,556,635
Corrections	667	2,020,698	20,779,616	22,800,314
System Support	268	2,451,690	10,626,144	13,077,834
Total	3,344	$10,840,416	$99,201,118	$110,041,534
Juvenile Justice**	757	2,175,530	19,094,067	21,269,597
Drug Abuse**	82	236,977	2,500,624	2,737,601

* *Funds expended over the history of the projects reported.*
** *Included in program component figures.*

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Table 4. Replications: Rank Order of Program Components As a Percentage of Category Totals 1980 and 1981

	1980		1981		
Category	Component	Percent of Category Total	Component	Percent of Category Total	% Change Between 1980/1981
Number of Projects	Enforcement	34	Adjudication	28	+2
	Adjudication	26	Enforcement	27	−7
	Corrections	17	Corrections	20	+3
	Prevention	15	Prevention	17	+2
	System support	8	System support	8	—
Expenditures	Enforcement	29	Adjudication	28	+1
	Adjudication	27	System support	22	+12
	Corrections	20	Corrections	19	−1
	Prevention	14	Enforcement	18	−11
	System support	10	Prevention	13	−1
Juvenile Justice*	Number of Projects	21	Number of Projects	23	+2
	Expenditures	20	Expenditures	20	—
Drug Abuse*	Number of Projects	4	Number of Projects	2	−2
	Expenditures	3	Expenditures	2	−1

** Included in program component figures.*

community relations, 16 percent; investigative services, 16 percent; communications, 15 percent; records and informations systems, 11 percent; organization and management, 6 percent; forensic services, 5 percent; patrol services, 3 percent; and personnel-administration, 3 percent.

Adjudication. The largest share of replications in this component focused on prosecution projects (30 percent). This category was followed, in order, by: victim-witness assistance, 19 percent; intake and pretrial services, 12 percent; judicial administration, 11 percent; detention and residential supervision, 7 percent; information systems, 6 percent; court planning, 5 percent; defense services, 5 percent; judicial process, 2 percent; facilities, 2 percent; and community relations, 1 percent.

Corrections. The distribution of corrections replications was as follows: facilities and facilities support services, 27 percent; inmate services, 22 percent; probation-parole-ex-offender services, 20 percent; special residences, 12 percent; organization and management, 8 percent; restitution programs, 7 percent; comprehensive correctional services, 3 percent; citizen information and action projects, 1 percent; and legal rights and responsibilities, 1 percent.

System Support. Replications in this component were reported as follows: program development, management, and assessment, 33 percent: training and education, 24 percent; information-communication systems, 18 percent; criminal justice research, 9 percent; miscellaneous projects, 9 percent; and comprehensive criminal justice programs, 8 percent.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Twenty-three percent of the replications reported had a juvenile justice component. As a percentage of projects within each component, juvenile justice projects were reported as follows: prevention, 55 percent; corrections, 21 percent; adjudication, 18 percent; enforcement, 14 percent; and system support, 9 percent.

Drug Abuse. Drug abuse projects accounted for only 2 percent of total replications. As a percentage of projects within each component, these projects were distributed as follows: prevention, 4 percent; corrections, 3 percent; and 1 percent each in adjudication, enforcement, and system support.

Accomplishment of State Project Goals

For the reporting year 1981 the CJC's were asked to provide data on all their projects that ended during 1981 in terms of how successful these projects were in meeting their objectives. A total of 7,276 projects were reported. Of this number, 7,154 (98 percent) were reported as having been successful and 124 (2 percent) as having failed to meet their objectives.

The accompanying tables present the numbers of projects and funding obligations in the five program components for projects where the purpose was achieved (Table 5) and where the purpose was not achieved (Table 6).

Aggregate Analysis. In terms of percentage of projects that achieved their purpose, the overall average was 98 per-

BEST DOCUMENT

Table 5. Program Purpose Achieved By Program Component Numbers of Projects and Amounts Expended

Program Component	Number of Projects	Expenditures in FY 1981	Expenditures in all Previous Years*	Total
Prevention	947	$ 2,443,110	$26,058,717	$28,501,827
Enforcement	2,376	3,368,358	53,873,921	57,242,279
Adjudication	1,754	4,756,796	54,001,700	58,758,496
Corrections	1,425	3,984,363	44,703,974	48,688,337
System Support	652	5,399,671	32,806,192	38,205,863
Total	7,154	$19,952,298	$211,444,504	$231,396,802
Juvenile Justice**	1,349	3,739,112	37,900,805	41,639,917
Drug Abuse**	162	286,385	5,079,274	5,365,659

* *Funds expended over the history of the projects reported.*
** *Included in program component figures.*

Table 6. Program Purpose Not Achieved By Program Component Numbers of Projects and Amounts Expended

Program Component	Number of Projects	Expenditures in FY 1981	Expenditures in all Previous Years*	Total
Prevention	22	$ 25,443	$ 328,077	$ 353,520
Enforcement	32	140,652	1,068,085	1,208,737
Adjudication	29	76,821	1,284,218	1,361,039
Corrections	25	121,202	962,407	1,083,609
System Support	16	96,995	733,476	830,471
Total	124	$461,113	$4,376,263	$4,837,376
Juvenile Justice**	27	49,112	857,247	906,359
Drug Abuse**	3	—0—	55,514	55,514

* *Funds expended over the history of the projects reported.*
** *Included in program component figures.*

Table 7. Program Component Achievement Levels

Program Component	Number of Projects	Purpose Achieved	Purpose Not Achieved	Ratio Achieved/Not Achieved
Total	7278	7154 (98%)	124 (2%)	57:1
Enforcement	2408	2376 (99%)	32 (1%)	74:1
Adjudication	1783	1754 (98%)	29 (2%)	60:1
Corrections	1450	1425 (98%)	25 (2%)	57:1
Prevention	969	947 (98%)	22 (2%)	43:1
System Support	668	652 (98%)	16 (2%)	41:1
Juvenile Justice*	1386	1349 (97%)	37 (3%)	36:1
Drug Abuse*	165	162 (98%)	3 (2%)	54:1

* *Included in program component figures above.*

BEST DOCUMENT

cent (See Table 7). Enforcement led all other program components with 99 percent. The figures for projects with a juvenile justice component showed an achievement level of 97 percent. Drug abuse projects scored 98 percent. The remaining components all scored at the overall average 98 percent.

State Project Continuations

States submitted data to LEAA on the total number of projects ending in fiscal year 1981, the number not continued after the termination of LEAA funds, the number of projects continued both at the State and local levels, and the number of projects which by their very nature were not eligible or intended to be continued.

Programs in juvenile justice and delinquency prevention and drug abuse are included in the five primary program categories and are reported again separately in response to congressional interest in these subject areas.

A total of 6,094 projects ended in 1981 (see Table 8). Of this number, 3,000 (49 percent) were continued with State, local, or other source funds (see Table 9). Of the remaining 3,094 projects, 928 (30 percent) were discontinued because funding was not available; 2,059 (67 percent) because they were not eligible; and 88 (3 percent) because they had had no appreciable impact.

Prevention showed the highest continuation rate (65 percent of all projects for which LEAA funding was terminated), followed by adjudication (56 percent), system support (49 percent), corrections (45 percent), and enforcement (42 percent). Sixty-five percent of both the juvenile justice and drug abuse projects were continued.

In addition to providing the number of projects continued by State and local units of government, the States reported on the *level* at which the projects were continued, i.e., increased, comparable, or reduced level. The indicators refer not so much to higher or lower dollar amounts as to the scope and activity levels of the project funding.

Approximately 67 percent of the projects continued after termination of LEAA funding were continued at levels comparable to that of the last year of LEAA funding. The remaining 33 percent were as follows: reduced level, 29 percent; increased level, 4 percent.

Table 8. Continuation of Projects After Termination of LEAA Funding

Projects for Which LEAA Funds Discontinued		Projects Continued With Non-LEAA Funds					Projects Not Continued				
		Increased Level	Comparable Level	Reduced Level	Total	(%)	Not Eligible	No Funds Available	No Impact	Total	(%)
Prevention	742	21	314	145	480	(65)	87	153	22	262	(35)
Enforcement	2,140	23	659	215	897	(42)	1,023	199	21	1,243	(58)
Adjudication	1,440	37	542	223	802	(56)	363	262	13	638	(44)
Corrections	1,234	23	350	177	550	(45)	469	194	21	684	(55)
System Support	538	18	144	109	271	(50)	117	139	11	267	(50)
Total	6,094	122	2,009	869	3,000	(49)	2,059	947	88	3,094	(51)
Juvenile Justice*	986	30	475	144	649	(65)	164	150	23	337	(35)
Drug Abuse*	139	4	62	24	90	(65)	24	23	2	49	(35)

* *Included in program component figures.*

Table 9. Number of Projects Continued With Non-LEAA Funds

Program Component	Number of Projects Continued	State	Percent	Local	Percent	Other Federal or Non-Government	Percent
Prevention	489	71	15	321	67	88	18
Enforcement	897	175	20	700	78	22	2
Adjudication	802	280	35	435	54	87	11
Corrections	550	220	40	251	46	79	14
System Support	271	113	42	131	48	27	10
Total	3,000	859	29	1,838	61	303	10
Juvenile Justice*	649	158	24	359	55	132	20
Drug Abuse*	90	27	30	48	53	15	17

* *Included in program component figures.*

National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) sponsors research, development, testing, and evaluation to improve crime control policies and strengthen criminal justice operations.

The Institute is divided into four offices, reflecting the basic functions assigned to it by the Congress in the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979. The Office of Research Programs supports studies aimed at developing more effective approaches to crime prevention and control and increasing knowledge about crime and criminal behavior. The Office of Research and Evaluation Methods supports projects to develop more reliable tools for measuring the effects of crime control policies and assessing the performance of criminal justice agencies. The Office of Program Evaluation sponsors assessments of the efficiency and effectiveness of criminal justice programs and procedures. The Office of Development Testing and Dissemination tests promising new crime control methods and, through various dissemination vehicles, transfers information about successful approaches to State and local officials who can put them into practice.

Research Highlights

The Institute works to resolve major problems hampering the effectiveness of criminal justice agencies and to discover new and improved methods for controlling crime. Recent examples of the impact of Institute research and experimentation include:

- A new approach to managing criminal investigations that includes case screening and other tested techniques that have been shown to improve efficiency while maintaining investigative effectiveness. Through NIJ sponsorship, some 600 State and local police officials received training in the new techniques. Another 700 benefited from locally-financed training and technical assistance using NIJ-developed materials. More than three-fourths of the workshop participants made changes in their department's investigative practices based on the research results.
- Techniques for streamlining jury operations that showed that jury pools can be reduced by 20 to 25 percent without adversely affecting the court. More than 100 courts have used the techniques to reform their jury operations, with substantial cost savings.
- Sentencing guidelines, based on past court practices, which provided for judicial discretion while encouraging greater consistency in sentencing. Some 20 States have or plan to develop sentencing guidelines. These efforts will benefit from the results of an NIJ field test on sentencing guidelines that is assessing the guidelines' impact on disparity both within and between different jurisdictions in a State.
- Alternative police responses to calls for service, minimizing the costly reliance on the immediate dispatch of a patrol car. Research has shown that only a small portion of the calls to police require an immediate response and that citizens will accept alternative responses if they are adequately informed. The approach, which offers the potential for freeing officers for more crime-focused duties, is gaining acceptance. The trend is expected to accelerate when the results are available from a field experiment testing a model response system.
- New strategies for combating arson — one of the most costly and destructive crimes — that have been widely disseminated to local communities. The techniques also have been used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its arson training courses and by the Federal Emergency Management Administration in training and technical assistance.

Violent Crime

A major priority of the Attorney General, violent crime has been the subject of a wide variety of NIJ-sponsored research efforts. Studies include an analysis of the factors that contribute to violent behavior and the formation of criminal careers. Research also focuses on specific types of violent crime. For example, last year the Institute completed a review and analysis of research and statistics on robbery, a crime in which actual or threatened violence is inflicted. Victimization data revealed that in 1978 one-third of the noncommercial robbery victims were injured. Although the vast majority of robbery victims are not injured seriously and property losses generally are less than $250, there is a large amount of gratuitous violence, excessive force that is not a consequence of victim resistance. The study recommended that robbery cases involving injury be given priority in the courts. Whether excessive violence is increasing in violent crimes such as robbery is a question that will be addressed in Institute research proposed for 1982.

Homicide is the subject of another study. It assessed the nature and patterns of the crime over a 10-year period. The study collected information from police records and medical examiners' offices in eight cities, located in four regions of the country. Nationwide data from the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports and vital statistics records were also analyzed. Homicide rates rose during the years 1968-1978, the preliminary findings show. The increase is reflected in both the UCR and the vital statistics records. An analysis of the latter data shows that nationwide homicides increased from 7.2 per 100,000 population in 1968 to a high of 10 per 100,000 in 1974, declining to 9.3 per 100,000 in 1978. The Northeast, South, and North Central regions exhibit similar patterns. However, the West experienced a steady increase in homicides throughout the entire period. Compared to other regions as well as the Nation as a whole, the South had the highest homicide rate of all, increasing from 10.9 homicides per 100,000 population in 1968 to 12.3 per 100,000 in 1978.

The release of the defendant who may pose a danger to the community is a key issue bearing on the violent offender's treatment within the criminal justice system. Guide-

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

lines developed by the Pretrial Services Agency of the District of Columbia are being assessed under an Institute grant. The guidelines weigh both potential danger to the community as well as the possibility the defendant will not appear for trial. The analysis will gauge the effectiveness of the guidelines and their impact on pretrial detention.

A related project, funded jointly by NIJ and the National Institute of Corrections, is analyzing the impact of guidelines for bail decisions. Similar in concept to the sentencing guidelines now being field tested by NIJ, the newly-developed guidelines for determining the release or detainment of defendants were created with the aid of judges in the Municipal Court of Philadelphia. The evaluation will assess the judges' use of the guidelines, their impact on pretrial detention rates, and their effectiveness in reducing rearrest and failure-to-appear rates.

A workshop on issues concerning the dangerous defendant held in February assessed existing knowledge on the topic and developed a research agenda. Sponsored by NIJ, the panel of experts convened by Harvard University reviewed research findings on identification of the habitual violent offender and addressed related legal issues.

Institute research has shown that a few highly active offenders account for a disproportionate amount of crime. Because the habitual offender appears to be central to controlling violent crime, the Institute is continuing to focus on career criminal research. For example, building on earlier research for NIJ, the Rand Corporation is now estimating the impact of various sanctioning policies on the rate of serious crime, including the effects of more severe penalties for habitual offenders.

Because the research also has established that habitual offenders begin criminal activity early in the juvenile years, the Institute commissioned Rand to do a pilot study of the use of juvenile records in adult court proceedings. Without the availability of these records, the study postulated, young adult offenders with serious juvenile histories might be treated similarly to first-time offenders.

A survey of prosecutor's offices throughout the country showed that half the respondents reported receiving little or no information on even the most serious young adult offenders in their jurisdictions. Of the 15 percent that reported a routine exchange of information between juvenile and adult courts, an information-sharing policy was implemented throughout the criminal justice system. In these jurisdictions, police were more likely to provide complete juvenile histories before preliminary hearings. Formal career criminal prosecution units were in place. Presentence reports routinely contained juvenile records. Records were centrally stored.

A preliminary examination of the sentencing in several sites tended to confirm the study's hypothesis that young adult offenders, whose juvenile records were not introduced into the proceedings, tended to get less severe sentences than did their older counterparts. A follow-up study will examine these issues in more detail by studying the sentencing of young offenders in four or five sites. The analysis will compare the sanctioning of different age groups of offenders, based on the use or absence of juvenile records.

On a related subject, last year the Institute funded an evaluation of Operation Hardcore, a special unit of the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office. Using techniques devised in career criminal prosecution programs, Operation Hardcore targets the habitual, violent gang offender for vigorous prosecution. The Institute evaluation will examine the program's impact on the prosecution and sentencing of defendants selected for the program compared to a control group receiving routine prosecutorial treatment.

Basic facts about violent behavior are being gathered under a long-term research project at the University of Pennsylvania. Under the direction of Dr. Marvin Wolfgang, the Center for Interdisciplinary Study of Criminal Violence is conducting a detailed inquiry on violent offenders, including factors related to their behavior, the characteristics of their careers, and their treatment by the criminal justice system. The profiles of violent offenders drawn from an analysis of a large body of data will chart the age of onset of criminality, intervals between offenses, patterns of offense severity as well as the likelihood of arrest, conviction, and incarceration. The research also will explore the feasibility of improving predictions of violent behavior based on characteristics emerging from the analysis that distinguish violent from nonviolent offenders.

Victims and Witnesses

Recent Institute efforts focus on the victims of particular crimes, including sexual assaults, and the needs and treatment of crime victims in general.

Programs in Seattle and the District of Columbia for treating the victims of child sexual abuse were designated last year as innovative models that other communities could follow. Careful validation of the programs demonstrated their effectiveness in treating these sensitive problems while simultaneously encouraging the vigorous prosecution of offenders.

An evaluation of 280 victim-witness programs throughout the country published last year found that special services for counselling victims and assisting witnesses in their court appearances are meeting important needs. Through transportation, childcare, and other arrangements provided by the witness programs, the appearance rate of witnesses has increased by 10 to 15 percent.

There is conflicting evidence about whether victims of an assault should attempt resistance. Some studies report that resistance effectively thwarts an assailant, whereas others suggest that the risk of injury is increased. A research project awarded in 1981 to Northwestern University will examine the responses of victims assaulted by strangers. Analyzing victimization data from the National Crime Survey of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the study will focus on ways in which victims resist assaults and the resulting outcome.

A program model on victim compensation the Institute published last year presented guidelines for officials in setting up and operating a statewide victim compensation program. Among the issues addressed were alternative approaches to location and staffing, public awareness, application procedures, program coverage, eligibility criteria, benefits, and costs. In the coming year the study will be updated and based on more recent experiences with victim compensation programs throughout the country. New analysis will focus particularly on costs and benefits, legislative options, and funding alternatives.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

A new approach to involving victims in the criminal justice process is being field tested in three jurisdictions. In this experiment victims and witnesses have the opportunity to present their views in plea negotiation sessions, which is a departure from the usual behind-the-scene negotiations for obtaining a guilty plea. An evaluation of the experiment will determine whether the formalized sessions produce a more efficient judicial process and more equitable agreements.

Police Resources

Police research in the last few years has shed new light on traditional approaches for responding to citizen needs. Studies of police response time in Kansas City, Missouri, and alternative approaches for service delivery in Wilmington have challenged assumptions about the need for rapid police response to all calls for service. Critical resources are reserved for the most serious and urgent situations, while alternative means of handling other types of calls capitalize on efficient service delivery.

Drawing on the findings of this research, the Institute has designed and implemented tests of differential police response in Toledo, Ohio, Greensboro, N.C., and Garden Grove, California. The sites will implement a classification system that prioritizes calls and matches them with a variety of possible responses. The range of alternatives for noncritical calls includes taking reports by appointment, requiring telephone or walk-in-reports from citizens, or using civilians—instead of sworn personnel—to take reports of noncrime incidents. An independent evaluation of the test will assess the effects of the responses on the delivery of police services. How the system affects the police officers' workload and whether there is a resulting shift in focus to additional crime-related activities also will be examined. Citizen satisfaction with the approach will be assessed as well.

Courts

Improving efficiency and equity in the pretrial process is an Institute research priority. Last year the Institute published the results of an evaluation of four courts that participated in the LEAA court delay reduction program. The four courts achieved significant reductions in delay by implementing a variety of strategies tailored to local conditions. Of the four sites, the Providence court achieved the greatest reduction in median case processing time, dropping from 277 days to 61 days. Dayton ranked next—decreasing from 69 days to 43 days. Las Vegas moved from 61 days to 47 days. And Detroit cut case processing time from 40 days to 19 days.

All the courts narrowed the gap between rates of disposition speed for different types of cases. Whether cases were pled or tried or defendants were detained on bail or released, the greater delay typically associated with any one of these alternatives was reduced, creating more even-handed justice. Patterns of disposition and sentences were not altered. Guilty pleas neither increased nor decreased. Sentences were neither harsher nor more lenient.

Public safety is a paramount concern for the courts, beginning with the pretrial phase. Issues bearing on pretrial arrest as well as failure-to-appear were examined in a recently completed NIJ study. From an examination of data on 6,000 defendants in 12 jurisdictions, the study found that 85 percent were granted release before their trial. Of that number, 13 percent failed to appear for a scheduled court appearance and 16 percent were rearrested.

Examining approaches for reducing the rearrest rate, the study reported that speedier trials would have the greatest impact. Trials held within 60 days would reduce the rearrest rate by one-third, and trials within 30 days would halve the number of rearrests. Imposing consecutive rather than concurrent sentences for pretrial crimes is another approach, one that the study recommended for further inquiry. This as well as other approaches for reducing multiple pretrial arrests is being explored in a study awarded in 1981.

Corrections

The Institute published "American Prisons and Jails," the most extensive report of the Nation's correctional institutions, during the year. Carried out in response to a congressional mandate, the study included research on factors linked to changes in imprisonment rates or number of inmates confined, including projections for future changes in incarcerated populations; a survey of conditions in prisons, jails, and halfway houses across the country; and case studies of various sentencing reforms and their effect on imprisonment rates. Involved in the study were 559 Federal and State prisons, 3,500 local jails, and 402 halfway houses. The study found that the number of inmates confined in jails and prisons doubled from 1972 through 1978.

To assist States in setting more systematic policies for the use of scarce prison space, the project produced a wealth of data on sanctioning practices, population projections, and prison conditions. The five-volume report is now a basic document for correctional policymakers and administrators who must deal with prison crowding.

Other Programs

The foregoing summarized some of the significant research findings for 1981 in key topical areas. During the year, the Institute continued to support improved methodology, the necessary underpinnings for ensuring that research and evaluation results are valid and reliable. Evaluations were sponsored to learn what innovative programs are likely to accomplish in the complex real-world setting of criminal justice. Research utilization efforts continued the process of developing concepts emerging from research into experimental models and accelerating an awareness and understanding of tested approaches to controlling crime. Highlights of these activities follow:

Research Methods. A study on correctional costs, using an econometric approach for modelling the prison system as

BEST COPY

an "industry," was completed in 1981 under the auspices of the Office of Research and Evaluation Methods. The project developed models that could be useful for answering questions, such as what size prison is most cost-effective and the marginal costs of correctional services.

Evaluation. Among the evaluations completed last year by the Office of Program Evaluation was an assessment of restitution programs that found that the programs can handle a large number of offenders and are relatively inexpensive to operate. Another, a reassessment of a crime prevention program in a commercial area of Portland, Oregon, found that the significant burglary reductions achieved under an earlier Institute project had been sustained in the two years after the close of the project.

Research Utilization. Last year the Office of Development, Testing, and Dissemination produced nine documents to assist practitioners and policymakers in adopting improved strategies in law enforcement, adjudication, and corrections. These syntheses of research and practical experience addressed a wide range of key needs of the field, including methods for preventing and controlling such violent crimes as arson and rape.

The Office also designed and implemented field tests of particularly significant innovative programs, such as the differential police response test described earlier. Three field experiments were implemented last year, with each model program generally installed in two or three jurisdictions. Policymakers and practitioners in participating communities received training and technical assistance in implementing the test design. Those skills enable the jurisdiction to continue the program if test results warrant.

If an evaluation of the experiment finds the model suitable for wider adoption, the results of the field test experiment will be published to guide other communities in adopting the approach. Program guides on managing criminal investigations and team policing were disseminated last year.

The Office also sponsors training workshops in advanced techniques. Some 678 State and local officials participated in these sessions during 1981.

Through the Technology Assessment Program, criminal justice agencies obtain scientifically sound information to assist them in purchasing the most effective and economical equipment. The program develops voluntary performance standards for criminal justice equipment and tests various products against these standards. The program developed five standards during 1981 and produced a guide to assist law enforcement agencies in selecting the most effective type of lightweight body armor. The armor, which is now virtually standard issue in police departments throughout the country, was first developed under NIJ-sponsored research.

Research findings developed by the Institute are published in a wide variety of formats designed to bring the information to the audiences that can use them. More than 40,000 criminal justice practitioners, policymakers, and researchers use the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, which maintains a data base of 60,000 documents covering all aspects of crime and justice.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the national repository for statistical information on crime and the operation of criminal justice systems at all levels of government. It also is the source of financial and technical support to State statistical and operating agencies in all 50 States and the developer of national information policy on such issues as data privacy, confidentiality and security, interstate exchange of criminal records, and related issues.

The establishment of the Bureau of Justice Statistics in December 1979 culminated more than half a century of recommendations calling for an independent and objective national center to provide basic information on crime to the President, the Congress, the judiciary, State and local governments, the general public, and the media. The Bureau was intended to insure (1) the collection of adequate statistics on crime and the response to crime from Federal State and local criminal justice agencies, (2) continuous work to improve the accuracy, completeness, and usefulness of these agencies' statistics, (3) assistance in the development of adequate State and local statistical systems, (4) continued attention to policy implications of criminal justice data collection, utilization, and exchange, and (5) the conduct of surveys, censuses, and special studies in response to immediate policy issues confronting the Department of Justice and the Congress.

National Indicators System Briefing. A major activity undertaken by the Bureau of Justice Statistics during fiscal year 1981 was its participation in the National Indicators System of the White House Office of Planning and Evaluation. The National Indicators System is designed to inform the President, the Vice-President, and the White House staff of social, demographic, and economic trends associated with a wide range of important domestic issues. In July 1981, the Bureau of Justice Statistics was assigned lead agency responsibility for the preparation of a briefing on violent crime in the United States. Bureau staff, in consultation with representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other agencies of the Department of Justice, developed the briefing material that was delivered to the President in September 1981. The briefing has also served as the basis for subsequent briefings for Department of Justice officials, including the Attorney General, and for congressional committees and staff. The briefing materials are available to criminal justice practitioners, key public interest groups, the academic community, and other interested parties.

Bulletins. Another major activity during 1981 was the initiation of the Bureau's bulletin series. The objective is to make available on a regular basis statistical information on selected topics concerning crime and the administration of justice. The bulletins are prepared in nontechnical language and are intended for a broad audience.

During the year eight bulletins were published, beginning with "Measuring Crime" in February 1981. Subsequent issues include "The Prevalence of Crime" (March 1981), "Prisoners in 1980" (May 1981), "Capital Punishment 1980" (July 1981), "Prisoners at Midyear 1981" (September 1981), "Veterans in Prison" (October 1981), "Victims of Crime" (November 1981), and "Crime and The Elderly" (December 1981).

National Crime Survey. The Bureau's most important statistical series is the National Crime Survey, which is the Nation's only regular crime rate measurement that collects data through national household surveys similar to the manner in which basic labor force statistics are gathered.

The data for developing survey statistics are provided to the Bureau of Justice Statistics by the U.S. Bureau of the Census from interviews in 60,000 households in which persons 12 years of age and older are asked if they were a crime victim during the preceding six months. The survey measures the amount of rape, robbery, assault, personal larceny, household burglary and larceny, and motor vehicle theft within the U.S. population. It also provides detailed information about the characteristics of the victims, the victim-offender relationships, and the criminal incident, including the extent of any loss or injury and whether or not the offense was reported to law enforcement officials.

In March 1981, the Bureau released findings on a new indicator developed from survey data on the prevalence of crime. The indicator measures the proportion of households touched by crime in an attempt to answer the question "What proportion of the American people is affected by crime?" During 1980 more than 24 million households—almost a third of the households in the Nation—were touched by crime. A similar proportion of households has been victimized by crime in each of the five years from 1976 through 1980 for which the measure has been calculated.

The Bureau has almost prepared a report on "Violent Crime in the United States" (report number 4) as a part of the National Indicators System. A report of the full findings is being released to the public.

Two reports on the impact of crime on the elderly have been prepared. They present findings from both the city surveys and the national sample on the extent to which the elderly are victimized (when compared with other age groups), the crimes to which they are particularly susceptible, and the consequences of this victimization.

The Bureau has developed estimates on the costs of crime in the United States. It has estimated that criminal victimization resulted in direct costs to the victim of $8.8 million during 1979.

Information from the National Crime Survey continues to affect criminal justice legislation at the Federal, State, and local levels in such matters as crime against the elderly, rape, stranger-to-stranger street crime, and costs of programs to compensate victims. The survey is the only source of information about the detailed characteristics of the victims of crime throughout the Nation. Thus, it gives legislators as well as the general public a view of which people in the population are disproportionately victimized as well as the impact of such criminal victimization on their lives.

Work is currently under way to redesign the National Crime Survey. It incorporates advances in the knowledge of victimization methodology that have occurred since the program began in 1972. The redesign will broaden the sur-

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

vey's scope to further increase its usefulness.

Dissemination of General Justice Statistics. During the year the Bureau published the eighth annual edition of the "Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics." It presents data from about 100 separate sources in an easy-to-use single volume and has proved to be extremely popular.

The National Criminal Justice Data Archive operated by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan expanded its activities in support of criminal justice analysis. It has continued to acquire and disseminate data files for secondary analysis. The holdings now include more than 50 data sets.

The archives has begun to disseminate microfilmed tabulations of National Crime Survey data prepared by the U.S. Bureau of the Census for those data users lacking access to computing facilities.

Twenty-one new statistical reports were published during the year. A total of 410,000 copies of those and previous years' reports were disseminated upon request to criminal justice practitioners and the general public. Approximately 2,000 requests for statistical information and assistance were received.

Courts Statistics. The Bureau continued to support the National Center for State Courts National Court Statistics Project during fiscal year 1981. The project is designed to reestablish the Census Bureau's court caseload series, which was discontinued in 1946.

The initial project products were two reports intended to improve the quality of data available through State court administrators' offices. The first of these the "State Court Model Statistical Dictionary," presents definitions and reporting instructions for major caseload categories. The "State Court Model Annual Report" sets forth a recommended caseload classification scheme and a data presentation format for annual reports of State court administrations. Using the reporting models recommended in these documents, the project staff has compiled State court annual reports for 1975 and 1976. These constitute the only source of statistics on State court caseload.

During the year the project staff completed compiling 1977 State court data and field-tested the model annual report format in one State. It also prepared for publication "State Court Organization, 1980" which contains data on State court organization and management. The project also provides continuing technical assistance to State court administrators in statistical matters.

Federal Statistics. During the year the Bureau initiated a major program in keeping with legislative requirements that it serve as a primary resource for information concerning the overall operation of the Federal justice system. Initial efforts were directed toward the in-house preparation of a comprehensive strategy outlining the steps to be taken toward a regularized program of Federal data acquisition, analysis, and dissemination. The Bureau also supported a major cooperative agreement designed to identify existing sources of data, evaluate data comparability, and propose feasible technical procedures for accessing and analyzing Federal crime data and the movement of offenders through the Federal justice system.

Under the Federal Statistics Program, the Bureau also has identified and addressed special issues of particular concern to Federal practitioners and policymakers. During the past year major efforts were conducted in the areas of high technology and computer crime as well as government program fraud.

Under the computer crime project, two major documents concerning the operational aspects of computer crime investigation and prosecution were published. In addition, preliminary reports were prepared in connection with projects examining the feasibility of data collection in the area of electronic funds transfer crime and the estimation of fraud in government programs.

Correctional Statistics Program. The Correctional Statistics Program, through a national series of sample surveys and censuses, provides objective statistical information in the areas of parole, probation, and corrections. Its four components are: the National Prisoner Statistics Program, Special Studies in Correctional Statistics, Uniform Parole Reports, and the National Probation Reports Study.

The National Prisoner Statistics Program provides data on prison population, prisoner characteristics, and persons under death sentences. These statistics are published annually in "Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions" and "Capital Punishment." In keeping with the intent of the bulletin series to provide timely information on crime and justice statistics, three bulletins utilizing data from the National Prisoner Statistics Program were published during 1981, "Prisoners in 1980," "Capital Punishment 1980," and "Prisoners at Midyear 1981." This last bulletin marks the inauguration of the quarterly collection of prison population data.

Special studies in correctional statistics focus on information that is not available from regular administrative sources. The special report, "Parole of Jail Inmates," was published based on the sociodemographic findings from the 1978 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails. Plans also have been made for the annual collection of statistics on the Nation's jail population by means of a sample survey with data collection to begin in June 1982. The 1979 National Survey of State Prison Inmates and National Census of State Correctional Facilities has resulted in the formulation of a female offender monograph and a report on State correction population and facilities, both to be published during 1982. Data from the national survey have also been used in the preparation of the "Veterans in Prison" bulletin to be released in early 1982.

The Uniform Parole Reports Program is a system for gathering, analyzing, and disseminating data on the characteristics of parolees, the size of that population, the number of parole agencies, and caseload size. These statistics are published annually in "Parole in the United States." Statistics are also kept on those successful on parole and those who recidivate within the three-year period following their release. The data are published annually in "Characteristics of the Parole Population."

The National Probation Reports Program explores ways of collecting probation statistics comparable to those for prisoners and parolees. During the year "Probation in the United States: 1979" was published. This was the first national report about population and workload statistics for adult probation. The Bureau plans to continue this series on aggregate probation data.

Privacy, Confidentiality, and Information Policy. In-

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

creased efforts have been made to enhance the Bureau's role in the area of data confidentiality and information policy. Accordingly, during the past year numerous projects were undertaken concerning the legislative mandate that the Bureau ensure both the confidentiality of statistics and research data and the privacy and security of criminal history information.

One project is identifying substantive and operational relationships between the legislative requirements and other Federal and State requirements and appraising the effect of these requirements on the quality, utility, and confidentiality of data. Another project is analyzing the various techniques employed in maintaining confidentiality and security standards in operational research computer centers. The objective of this latter project is to identify cost-effective techniques that can be used by researchers to protect identifiable data maintained by computer.

Efforts were also undertaken to help State and local agencies comply with the Bureau's regulations on the privacy and security of criminal history information. Several documents were released that reviewed recent legislation on privacy, security, and confidentiality that discussed relevant issues.

State Statistical Support Programs. The Congress has directed the Bureau to "give primary emphasis to problems of State and local justice systems" and "utilize to the maximum extent feasible State government organizations and facilities responsible for the collection and analysis of criminal justice data and statistics." The Bureau has responded by building on major findings and assistance efforts previously undertaken, by expanding the analytic capabilities of the State, by encouraging cooperation among the States in addressing common problems, and by enhancing the ability of the State to provide the Bureau with data for national compilations.

Through the Bureau's support, statistical analysis centers for criminal justice data have been established in approximately 40 States. They provide statistical information services and policy guidance to the Governors, executive branch agencies, legislators, the judiciary, the press, and the public. In addition, they play a vital role in collecting and submitting data to the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

In many States, the statistical analysis center has been made a part of the State government by legislation or executive order.

During the year 12 grants and cooperative agreements were awarded for continuing the operation of State statistical analysis centers. In addition, the Bureau entered into cooperative agreements with a number of statistical analysis centers for the performance of specific tasks in accordance with programs developed by the Bureau, including establishing and maintaining a clearinghouse for criminal justice information. It also will be a means for the Bureau of Justice Statistics and State criminal justice agencies to investigate issues in criminal justice and develop methods and techniques for analyzing them. It will present and analyze data on the processing and dispositions of felony arrestees. These data, which are derived from OBTS (offender-based transaction statistics) systems that the States have developed with the Bureau's assistance, will subsequently be aggregated to provide the first multi-State statistics on the processing of offenders after arrest.

The Bureau also supports the operation of State uniform crime reporting agencies in 44 States to facilitate the submission and improve the validity and reliability of arrest and clearance data submitted by local police agencies to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. During the past year grants were awarded to four States for the completion of their systems.

Major support for State and local agencies was provided in the design, development, and transfer of computer-based automated information systems. Ongoing projects were continued and technical help was provided for installation of the Prosecutor's Management Information System (PROMIS). Information derived from PROMIS is being used for the multijurisdictional analysis of judicial activities.

The development of criminal justice information systems included AMICUS (Attorney Management Information and Cardfile User Supports), a management information system for local public defender offices, and four law enforcement information systems programs. These latter systems provide standardized automated record-keeping and analytic capability for law enforcement purposes. In addition to allowing improved retrieval, utilization, and analysis of data by the user agencies, these systems are potential sources of data for the Bureau.

Thirty-three States are participating in the development of OBSCIS (Offender-Based State Correctional Information System), designed to meet the operational and management needs of State correctional departments and to provide data for correctional statistics programs. Twenty-eight States have achieved a basic operational capability. All of the systems should be fully implemented within the next year. Prototype information systems were implemented in selected States to support jail management and the management, operation, and statistical reporting of State prison industries. Analytic methods and techniques have been developed and are being provided to State correctional departments for use in forecasting prison population, statistical reporting, and the improved use of existing data bases.

BEST Document Available

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention develops and implements programs to prevent and reduce juvenile delinquency. It designs new ways to divert juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice system and to provide critically needed alternatives to institutionalization. It helps State and local governments and public and private agencies conduct effective juvenile justice and delinquency prevention and rehabilitation programs and offers research, evaluation, and training services in juvenile delinquency prevention. The Office also coordinates policy for all Federal juvenile delinquency related programs.

Within the Office there is a research, standards, training, and information branch—the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The Office also administers a special emphasis discretionary grant program through which it develops and implements national scope juvenile justice and delinquency prevention demonstration programs. Finally, the Office provides formula grants directly to the States and territories.

Formula Grant Program

Sections 223(A)(12) through (15) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act contain the major deinstitutionalization, separation, jail removal, and monitoring clauses of the statute. The status of State implementation of these clauses is as follows:

Fifty-one States and territories currently participate in the JJDP Act. The six States that are currently not participating are Hawaii, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

December 31 of each year has been established as the date States must submit their annual monitoring reports. According to the most recently submitted reports, all States participating in the formula grant program have made progress in deinstitutionalizing status offenders. The following 49 States have evidenced at least a 75 percent reduction in the numbers of status offenders and nonoffenders held in detention since their participation in the Act:

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
Dist. of Columbia
Missouri
Montana
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
Ohio
Oregon
Florida
Georgia
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
Wisconsin
Puerto Rico
American Samoa
Guam
Trust Territories
Virgin Islands
No. Marianas

Of these States, 24 have been found to be in full compliance with the Act's status offender deinstitutionalization provision.

The nationwide baseline data for the number of status offenders and nonoffenders held in secure detention and correctional facilities was determined to be 198,795. This figure was calculated from the baseline information provided in the 1979 monitoring reports. With approximately 35,039 being currently held, the number of status offenders and nonoffenders held in secure facilities over the past five years has been reduced by 83.4 percent. This computes to a national ratio of 57.9 status offenders and nonoffenders securely held per 100,000 juvenile population under age 18 years old.

The following 46 States have demonstrated progress in separating juveniles from adults in jails, detention facilities, and correctional facilities:

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
Dist. of Columbia
Montana
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Oregon
Florida
Georgia
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Puerto Rico
American Samoa
Guam
Virgin Islands

Of these States, 19 have demonstrated full compliance with the Act's separation provision.

During fiscal year 1981 the number of juveniles held in regular contact with adults was reduced from 58,058 to 39,041. This is a comparison of those held in regular con-

tact as reported in the State 1979 monitoring report versus the 1980 report. This shows a 32.8 percent reduction during the past year.

The Congress, in its 1980 reauthorization of the JJDP Act, provided for the removal of all juveniles from adult jails and lock-ups within a five-year period. In addition, however, the Congress required that within 18 months of the Act's reauthorization a report be completed by OJJDP outlining the potential impact of the removal effort. Work is currently under way to collect the information needed to assess the costs and potential ramifications which may result from the removal requirement. Additionally, an analysis will be conducted to determine whether such a requirement would lead to an expansion of the residential capacity of secure detention facilities and secure correctional facilities for juveniles. Current estimates indicate that more than 479,000 children are being held in 8,833 adult jails and lock-ups each year.

In addition to providing for projects that have accomplished the above goals, formula funds were used to fund a number of other worthwhile projects consistent with the formula grant mandates. These programs generally concern serious and violent juvenile offenders, alternatives to the juvenile justice system, delinquency prevention, improvements in the juvenile justice system, and the training of State or local personnel.

Technical Assistance

The Juvenile Justice Technical Assistance Program is designed to make available the knowledge of juvenile justice and management experts for the successful development and implementation of juvenile delinquency programs. Needs are submitted to the Office from sources nationwide. Regular six-month cycles have been established for technical assistance planning and delivery. Each cycle consists of needs assessment, workplan development, delivery, documentation and follow-up, if necessary.

During 1981 more than 700 specific technical assistance requests were responded to by OJJDP contractors, who were selected by competition in accordance with Federal laws and regulations. Each contractor's statement of work sets out a specific Office goal in which the contractor concentrates its efforts.

Assistance is provided in a number of ways, for example, on-site consultation, workshops, distribution of materials, or telephone assistance. One of the most effective methods of providing information, however, is through the development of resource documents. During 1981 the following documents were produced for dissemination by the contractors:

- *"Programs for Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders"*
- *"Delinquency Prevention: Theories and Strategies, 2nd Edition"*
- *"Improving the Quality of Youth Work: Strategy for Delinquency Prevention"*
- *"Delinquency Prevention: Selective Organizational Change in the Schools, 2nd Edition"*
- *"A Guide for Delinquency Prevention Programming Through Selective Change in School Organizations"*
- *"A Guide for Delinquency Prevention Based on Educational Activities"*
- *"Improving the Quality of Youth Work Strategy for Delinquency Prevention, 2nd Edition"*
- *"Forum on Deinstitutionalization: Selected Readings on Children in Adult Jails and Lock-ups"*
- *"Prohibiting Secure Juvenile Detention: Assessing the Effectiveness of National Standards Detention Criteria"*
- *"An Assessment of the National Incidence of Juvenile Suicide in Adult Jails"*
- *"Lock-ups and Juvenile Detention"*
- *"Removing Children from Adult Jails: A Guide to Action"*
- *"The Unjailing of Juveniles in America/It's Your Move"*
- *"National Assessment of Compliance Monitoring Practices for the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act"*
- *"Juvenile Justice Restitution Working Papers (Volumes 1-5)"*
- *"A Policy and Procedures Manual for the Violent Juvenile Offender Sites"*
- *"Preliminary Training Manuals for Project New Pride and Replication of Project New Pride."*

Research and Program Development

Pursuant to the provisions of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP) is the research, training, standards, and information arm of the Office. Its research and evaluations are designed to provide the basis for juvenile justice and alternative system program development and to generate data for carrying out the other mandated functions of NIJJDP, which include training, program development, standards development, and information dissemination. These services are provided to juvenile justice practitioners at the State and local levels.

Section 243 of the Act authorizes the Institute to conduct and coordinate research and evaluation into any aspect of juvenile delinquency, to provide for program development, and to conduct specific studies in prevention and treatment. Several provisions added by the 1980 Amendments to the Act suggest a program focus on serious and violent offenders, with particular attention on sentencing, providing resources necessary for informed dispositions, and rehabilitation.

NIJJDP's research and development process has been designed to follow a logical, evolutionary path. This involves research leading to problem definition and to the identification of intervention program strategies, program development and implementation; testing and evaluation; training; and the dissemination of program information for State and local application.

The general areas addressed by NIJJDP's research and development effort include delinquent behavior and prevention, the juvenile justice system, and alternative programs. A significant emphasis in each area is on work concerning serious and violent offenders.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

NIJJDP is only about six years old. Its responsibilities include longitudinal research and program evaluations, each of which often requires three or more years to complete. Thus, the Institute's work and accomplishments must be viewed from a developmental perspective. Its activities (knowledge development and application) are best characterized as incremental, continuous, and cumulative.

The first three to four years were devoted to developing a general picture of juvenile delinquency in the United States. This involved the collection and analysis of national self-reported data, victimization data, arrest statistics, juvenile court processing data and statistics on the number of juveniles in various types of facilities. These efforts established the first reliable national estimates of the magnitude of the delinquency problem and baseline data for monitoring trends in the volume and patterns of delinquency in the United States.

The second major thrust of the Institute's first few years was to identify the parameters and significant issues in delinquent behavior and prevention, the juvenile justice system, and alternatives to the juvenile justice system. This was accomplished through nationwide assessments of existing research and programs. The assessments established the state-of-the art on such topics as prevention, diversion, serious juvenile crime, juvenile court structure and operations, and alternatives to incarceration. They served to organize information and provide direction for more intensive studies of the causes of delinquency, the policies and practices of the juvenile justice system, and the operation and effectiveness of various alternatives to the system.

The knowledge developed to date is increasingly applied to program development, testing, and evaluation; standards development; and the training of personnel in juvenile justice.

A part of NIJJDP's research has assessed the extent and nature of delinquency in the United States. This has included national sample studies of self-reported delinquency and drug use; analyses of victimization data; analyses of official police, court, and corrections data; cohort and other longitudinal research (local samples) pertaining to the frequency, patterns, and trends of delinquent behavior; and a national assessment of juvenile gang activity. Such research has dealt with offender and offense characteristics, with the magnitude of violent and serious juvenile crime as compared to less serious delinquency, and with the measurement of relationships between juvenile and adult criminal careers.

The direction of overall findings suggests that there has not been a measurable increase in delinquency during the last five years. However, the extent of the delinquency problem must be considered unacceptable, as juvenile arrests make up almost 40 percent of all arrests for serious property and violent offenses. Also, while violent juvenile crime constitutes a relatively small percentage of all juvenile offenses, such crime poses a substantial threat to public safety and incurs social and economic costs that are proportionately greater than its prevalence in the total crime picture.

Besides studies of the extent of delinquency, NIJJDP research has also addressed the juvenile justice system's processing of juvenile offenders. Results indicate that, in contrast with past increases, there has been a leveling off in the volume of cases handled by juvenile courts and a marked decrease in the detention and incarceration of status offenders during the last three to five years. A major NIJJDP concern has involved dispositions and sanctions imposed on juveniles. Some Institute supported research results question the effectiveness of secure custody for most juvenile offenders, both in terms of the high cost and enhanced recidivism associated with incarceration. While violent and dangerous offenders certainly require secure custody, there is an indication that even some serious offenders can best be handled in community-based programs that link correctional measures with community reintegration efforts. Other NIJJDP-sponsored research has called into question the efficacy of adult court handling of serious and violent juvenile offenders.

A third area of NIJJDP research concentration is on alternative programs to the traditional justice system approaches. Study results show that general diversion programs are no less effective than regular justice system processing. Moreover, preliminary evaluation results show restitution programs, including payments to the victim and public service by the offender, are successful alternatives to traditional probation or incarceration. They also allow crime victims to recover an average of 84 percent of their net losses.

Overall, NIJJDP-supported research—particularly an evaluation of the major correctional reform in Massachusetts leading to deinstitutionalization of juvenile offenders—has established the community, not the secure care institution, as the effective environment for delinquency control. Such research stresses the importance of the reintegration of juvenile offenders and the expansion of legitimate opportunities for youth in the community.

NIJJDP's research, in addition to providing the findings summarized above, has led to the development and improvement of prevention, justice system, and alternative programs. Its research approach has included both research and development and evaluation.

A specific example of research utilization in the designing, implementation and testing of program interventions is represented by NIJJDP's work in the area of learning disabilities and delinquency. This has resulted in a remediation program for afflicted children and in program information applicable to agency personnel training, diagnosis, and treatment.

A national evaluation of six NIJJDP-supported law related education projects has shown them to have a positive effect on youth behavior and, when implemented properly, to have a potential for delinquency prevention or reduction among students enrolled in such courses.

NIJJDP's work to date suggests that delinquent behavior can be controlled through a variety of program approaches when they are based on sound research data and when they are rigorously tested and refined in accordance with evaluation results.

FY 1982 Research Plan

During 1982 NIJJDP will focus research and development work on the serious and violent juvenile offender. This includes a continuation of an already established violent juvenile offender research and development program. Part I is designed to implement and test strategies for the treatment and reintegration of violent offenders. Part II will test promising indigenous community approaches to the prevention of violent and serious delinquency.

NIJJDP also will continue a major prevention research

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

and development program that tests specific interventions believed to hold promise with families, schools, peers, and employment in the community.

The Institute also expects to update the current knowledge about the prevalence and trends of violent and serious delinquency and to support research on the careers of violent and serious juvenile offenders to improve the predictability of such behavior.

The Institute also plans to continue its national evaluations of OJJDP-funded demonstration programs, such as the Replication of Project New Pride for serious offenders, Alternative Education, Youth Advocacy, Law Related Education, and Restitution.

Training

During 1981 the training program was concentrated in three major areas—Law-Related Education, Judges and Court Personnel, and Alternative Juvenile Justice Programs Personnel.

Law-Related Education. Fiscal year 1981 was the end of Phase I of the OJJDP's Law-Related Education Program. The results of a national evaluation indicated that the programs had been implemented in more than 130 communities, had obtained agreements from 20 law schools for law student assistance in such classrooms, and had operated 10 geographically dispersed centers to support it. In-service teacher training is now widely available. There were four regional conferences and five workshops on law pertaining to young persons.

During 1981, there were more than 109 training sessions for more than 3,876 participants. The program was implemented in more than 3,000 classrooms and was institutionalized in 1,600 classes. About 30 new sites were established in 1981, and one foreign country (Canada) participated in a Moot Court at the United Nations as well as a United States high school. A conservative estimate is that the program reached about 276,690 people.

Judges and Court Personnel. Judicial training conducted by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges was available to more than eight categories of juvenile justice personnel. A total of 1,835 participants were trained in 24 training sessions. Of this number, 313 judges were trained, 168 attorneys, 352 probation officers, 94 law enforcement personnel, 80 corrections personnel, 575 child care workers, 220 educators, and 33 court-related personnel.

Alternative Juvenile Justice Programs. The NIJJDP's 1981 alternative juvenile justice training program was conducted by three alternative projects—Project Read, National Youth Workers Alliance, and the Villages. During 1981 these projects trained more than 995 participants at 15 training sessions and 13 conferences, seminars, or workshops. Of the participants trained, 175 were teachers, 300 students, 515 juvenile justice personnel, three judges, and two lawyers. The training covered such vital areas as literacy, group homes, residential treatment, shelter care, runaway facilities, counseling, diversion, youth employment, program management, youth participation, substance abuse prevention and treatment, advocacy, and service coordination. More than 31 States and 63 communities were served.

Summary of Training Activities. More than 6,800 participants were trained at 148 training sessions, 162 awareness sessions, and 69 seminars, conferences, or workshops. All States, three territories, and two foreign countries were served.

Information Dissemination

The Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse operated at the National Criminal Justice Reference Service performed most of the distribution functions of NIJJDP. As of September 1981 the requests to the Clearinghouse accounted for 18 percent of all reference requests received by the Reference Service. There were 3,341 requests. Of this total 913, or 27 percent, were received via the toll-free users' telephone number.

The Clearinghouse also provided information support services to 19 conferences. Since the award of the contract in July 1979, approximately 289,406 documents have been distributed by the Clearinghouse. Of these documents, 196,350 were NIJJDP documents (68 percent). During fiscal year 1981 approximately 54,642 documents were distributed; of that total 50,825 (93 percent) were NIJJDP documents. In addition to performing distribution functions, the Clearinghouse assisted NIJJDP in printing and publishing new documents. During 1981, three major issues documents, four assessment center reports, and four monographs were printed.

Reports published during 1981 include:

- *Reports of the National Juvenile Justice Assessment Centers:*
  - *Implementation Issues.*
  - *Juvenile Delinquency Prevention: A Compendium of 36 Program Models.*
  - *Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Experiments: A Review and Analysis.*
  - *A Preliminary National Assessment of the Numbers and Characteristics of Juveniles Processed in the Juvenile Justice System.*
- *Analyses of National Crime Victimization Survey Data to Study Serious Delinquent Behavior:*
  - *Monograph One—Juvenile Criminal Behavior in the United States: Its Trends and Patterns.*
  - *Monograph Two—Juvenile Criminal Behavior: An Analysis of Rates and Victim Characteristics.*
  - *Monograph Three—Juvenile Criminal Behavior in Urban, Suburban, and Rural Areas.*
  - *Monograph Four—Juvenile Criminal Behavior and Its Relation to Economic Conditions.*
- *Major Issues in Juvenile Justice Information and Training: Services to Children in Juvenile Courts, The Judicial-Executive Controversy.*
- *Report of NIJJDP, Fiscal Year 1980.*
- *The Use of Secure Detention for Juveniles and Alternatives to Its Use—National Study of Juvenile Detention.*
- *Reports of the National Juvenile Justice Assessment Centers:*
  - *An Assessment of Evaluations of Drug Abuse Prevention Programs.*

BEST DOCUMENT

A Comparison of Involvement in Delinquent Behavior and Status Offenses.
A National Assessment of Case Disposition and Classifications in the Juvenile Justice System: Inconsistent Labeling.
Vol. I: Process Description and Summary
Vol. II: Results of a Literature Search.
Vol. III: Results of a Survey.
A National Assessment of Serious Juvenile Crime and the Juvenile Justice System: The Need for a Rational Response.
Vol. I: Summary
Vol. II: Definition, Characteristics of Incidents and Individuals, and Relationships to Substance Abuse.
Vol. III: Legislation, Jurisdiction, Program Interventions, and Confidentiality of Juvenile Records.
Vol. IV: Economic Impact.

- *A Preliminary National Assessment of Child Abuse and Neglect and the Juvenile Justice System: Role Conflicts, Constraints, and Information Gaps.*
- *A Typology of Caused - Focused Strategies of Delinquency Prevention.*

Information Synthesis

The NIJJDP Assessment Center Program generated a total of 16 reports. Nine reports concerned serious, violent crime. During the course of the publication review process a total of 21 Assessment Center reports have been screened by NIJJDP staff. Additionally, five Assessment Center reports have been forwarded to NCJRS for publication, and to date 35 Assessment Center reports have been determined to be inappropriate for broad dissemination but are available through NCJRS on microfiche, interlibrary loan, and/or the NCJRS Reading Room.

A total of 24 applications were received for the Exemplary Projects Program. One application was selected for a screening and one selected for validation. Currently, five applications are pending final evaluation.

Information Systems and Data Collection

The Juvenile Information System and Records Access Project is operated by the National Council for Juvenile and Family Court Judges. During 1981 a merger of the system and the Child and Youth-Centered Information System was begun. This was a result of the need for cooperation between juvenile justice and child welfare agencies, and from all indications it will enhance the applicability of both systems. A newsletter entitled "Projections" was initiated during the year, and the first issue was released in June.

System transfers were completed in Middlesex County, New Jersey, and Las Vegas. Currently, the Las Vegas system is undergoing a test. In addition, both the Rhode Island and District of Columbia systems were modified, and a conceptual design for the "Post-Dispositional Module" for the JISRA system was developed. There were a total of three feasibility studies performed, an additional three feasibility studies negotiated and scheduled, and two system demonstrations performed for Cook County and San Bernardino County.

The National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System is the only national reporting system on juvenile court handling of juveniles. The project is operated by the National Center for Juvenile Justice. Formerly known as the Juvenile Court Statistical Reporting System (when sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), this system has been greatly improved. It now contains a wide range of information on over one-half of all cases handled each year by juvenile courts. This data archive permits a variety of special analyses such as one recently published on serious and violent juvenile offenders entitled "The Serious Juvenile Offender: Scope of the Problem and the Response of Juvenile Courts."

Under a grant to the University of Chicago, data collection for the National Surveys of Programs and Agencies Providing Residential and Nonresidential Services to Children and Youth with Special Problems began in September 1981.

Approximately 6,000 residential and 2,000 nonresidential (out of approximately 10,000 eligible) programs were identified for study. This research is a replication and expansion of a landmark study conducted 15 years ago and promises to provide the most comprehensive information on programs for youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice, mental health, and child welfare systems.

Analysis of the data from the 1977 and 1979 Children in Custody census of public and private juvenile detention and correctional programs was completed by the Census Bureau. The final report will be published in 1982.

Standards

During 1981 the Standards Program concentrated on standards development and dissemination, program development and planning, and research (legal and social science) concerning standards implementation.

The year marked the end of a decade of work concerning the development of juvenile justice standards. With the completion of the final revisions of the Institute of Judicial Administration/American Bar Association Juvenile Justice Standards, 23 volumes of standards and a summary volume have been published.

In all, four major national standards-setting bodies have developed a total of 31 volumes dealing with virtually every aspect of the administration of juvenile justice. Recognizing the potential confusion in the field and the difficulty of working with this amount of material, NIJJDP sought to provide a framework for the review and adoption of standards by developing "A Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Justice Standards and the JJDP Act." This analysis concluded that the four sets of standards reflect a substantial agreement with the major policies of the JJDP Act even though particular approaches may vary.

Other efforts to make the standards more readily available were undertaken by the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse through the development of bibliographies and information packages. During the last year more than 12,000 copies of the standards developed pursuant to Section 247 of the JJDP Act, "Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice," were distributed nationwide.

BEST DOCUMENT

In late 1981 NIJJDP sponsored a series of three symposia on the Judicial, Administrative, and Legislative Uses of Juvenile Justice Standards. They were attended by approximately 90 judges, court administrators, attorneys, correctional administrators, law enforcement officers, and legislators from the six New England States.

Special Emphasis Program

The current status of the Special Emphasis Program is such that three major program efforts were to be largely completed with 1982 funds. These were not slated to receive fiscal year 1983 funding. These three programs, along with programs completed in prior years, have covered most of the Special Emphasis Program categories authorized by Section 224(a) (12) of the Act.

The 1980 Amendments to the Act provide an impetus to programs for youths who commit serious and violent crimes. The status of each program area is described below.

Violent Juvenile Offender Projects. The Violent Juvenile Offender Program is a two-part program. Part I is a Treatment and Reintegration Program. Part II is Prevention of Violent Juvenile Crime.

For both the Office has funded a National Coordinator to survey existing approaches, develop a request for proposals, and manage selected contracts. The Part I Cooperative Agreement for $3,911,998 went to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency on September 30, 1980. The Part II contract was awarded to the Small Business Administration on September 30, 1980, and to L. Miranda and Associates (an 8-A Firm) on October 6, 1980. The contract was for $400,000. This contract was supplemented with $2,500,000 for site awards on September 30, 1981.

For Part I, approximately 17 sites were visited by staff in early 1981. A guideline and background paper were developed and released on March 13, 1981. Fifteen applications were received. From these nine were selected to submit final applications. A bidder's conference was held in Kansas City, Missouri, on June 16 and 17, 1981, to clarify program requirements. Final applications were submitted on July 24, 1981, and the final selection of five sites were made and approved in 1981. These five sites are Phoenix, Denver, Memphis, Newark, and Boston.

For Part II, 31 projects were surveyed October 1980 through January 1981. A request for proposals and background paper have been developed and approved.

Youth Advocacy Projects. From April through September 1980, 22 Youth Advocacy grants were awarded throughout the United States. Grants totaled $13,945,936.

The Youth Advocacy grantees are located in 18 States throughout the country. The grantees have emphasized making the statutes, regulations, policies, and practices of the juvenile justice system, the education system, and the social services system more supportive of the needs of youth and their families and more accountable in expenditure of public and private funds allocated for youth services.

The grantees represent many different types of organizations, including the North Carolina Governor's Advocacy Council on Children and Youth, which operates under the auspices of the Governor's Office; the Parent's Union for Public Schools in Philadelphia, an independent citywide parents organization; and the Wisconsin Youth Policy and Law Center, a statewide private, nonprofit organization. In accordance with program guideline requirements, all grantees provided letters demonstrating civic and community support for their Youth Advocacy grants.

The 22 Youth Advocacy projects specified 1,338 activities to be implemented in pursuit of their subobjectives. Some of their educational activities include newsletters, conferences, educational materials, and training. Statute revision activities include drafting legislation, monitoring the legislature, and, at the request of legislators, providing expert testimony at committee hearings. Administrative negotiations are being conducted with judges, social service system administrators, and school personnel.

The grant period for this program is three years with awards made in increments of 24 months and 12 months. All 22 grantees are currently in their second grant year. They are eligible to receive third year funding during April through September of 1982. Third year continuation awards are competitive and contingent upon satisfactory grantee performance in achieving stated objectives in the previous program year(s), availability of funds, and compliance with the terms and conditions of the grants.

OJJDP monitoring and the evaluation data from the American Institute for Research indicate that the advocacy grantees have succeeded in starting most of the activities called for by their projects.

Alternative Education Projects. The major objective of the Alternative Education Program is to prevent juvenile delinquency through the development and implementation of projects designed to keep students in schools, prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions, and reduce dropout, psuhout, and truancy rates.

This program was funded in late 1980. A total of $11,544,347 has been allocated to 18 projects located in ten States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The eighteenth project was funded in September 1981. Seventeen of the projects funded have been in operation for a year and are now in their second year of operation. This includes 94 sites which are mostly school-based. Programmatically, most of the projects met their goals and objectives in a satisfactory manner during their first year of operation and have gotten off to a good start in the second year. It is anticipated that all of the Alternative Education projects will apply for third-year funding and that 10 will probably meet performance criteria at a sufficiently high level to be funded.

Additional facts of interest on these projects are as follows:

- An estimated 10,000 students have successfully participated in various project-related activities.
- Eighty-five percent of the projects have initiated some level of systems change within the structures they are working with, which are for the most part public school systems. These changes range from simply getting students, parents, teachers, and school officials talking and recognizing each other for the first time to an entire school district adopting an alternative technique to expulsions and suspensions and making these techniques school district policy.
- At least 1,000 teachers and school officials have received

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

training in techniques that will help them to better serve targeted students.

POLARIS Research and Development was awarded a contract in August 1981 to provide technical assistance to the Alternative Education projects.

John Hopkins University, in conjunction with the Social Action Research Center, is conducting an independent evaluation of the Alternative Education Program.

New Pride Projects. The New Pride projects moved into their second year of operation during 1981. Three of the 10 projects experienced major problems and were terminated during 1981. They were in East Los Angeles, Boston, and Washington, D.C.

The other seven projects were on target. As of November 30, 1981, New Pride projects had served 661 youth. A preliminary report indicates the projects are meeting target population requirements. The average New Pride client has 7.8 prior offenses, 4.6 of them sustained by the time of admission to the project. Other important preliminary report findings include the following:

- The average monthly percentage of clients committing offenses dropped 2.5 times after admission to New Pride, and the average number of offenses per month dropped 3.7 times.
- The average percent of unexcused absences from school dropped from 58 percent before the program to 36 percent during the program, or by more than a third.
- Two-thirds of the New Pride clients had totally dropped out of school by the time they entered the program.
- With 72 clients post-tested on the Key Math, the average gain for white clients was 5.46 points, for black clients it was 12.5 points, and for Hispanic clients it was 12.6 points. All gain score differences were highly significant statistically from pretests to post-tests.

All program components are in place. However, there is a need to strengthen the employment and volunteer components of many of the projects during the third year. Many of the projects have begun small business ventures. For example, New Jersey has begun a food preparation and take out service, Florida has established a lawn service, and Kansas City prepares and builds soccer fields and goals. Third and final year awards have been made to all but one of the grantees from fiscal year 1982 funds.

Juvenile Restitution Projects. Thirty-six Restitution projects received third-year funding and operated during 1981. Of these, 11 ended their Federal funding period as of October 30, 1981, and five more will terminate as of December 31, 1981. Of the projects for which Federal funding ceased, 11 have been picked up by local funding sources. It is expected that approximately 60 percent of the projects will be picked up by local funding.

The Restitution Program accomplishments for the first two years are as follows:

- There were 17,300 youths referred for two years of project operation.
- The offenses which resulted in these referrals involved more than 18,390 victims and $9.5 million in losses.
- Judges ordered $2.5 million in monetary payments, 355,000 hours of community service, and 6,052 victim service hours.
- Based on data from more than 15,427 closed cases (89 percent of all referrals), juveniles ordered to make monetary restitution paid $1,532,966, worked 259,092 community service hours, and performed more than 4,060 hours of community service.
- Seventy-seven percent of the youth referred are successfully completing their original or adjusted restitution orders. This successful completion rate goes to 86 percent if project ineligibles are not considered.
- Eighty-three percent of the referrals have had no subsequent contact with the juvenile court after the offense that resulted in a referral to the project and prior to their case closure.

The data provided is for two years of project operation for the original 41 projects (36 projects continued into the third year). The data base was closed at this date because of reduced funds for the evaluation and because of the need to begin data analysis with a set data base.

Capacity Building Projects. During 1981, 15 grants were awarded to youth-serving agencies under the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency Through Capacity Building Program. A total of $6,701,196 was awarded to 15 grantees selected from a field of 540 applicants. The grants are supporting activities that will increase the capacity of State and local governments, public and private youth-serving agencies, and indigenous neighborhood organizations or community groups to prevent delinquency, develop and utilize alternatives to the juvenile justice system, and improve the administration of juvenile justice.

Twelve of the capacity building projects are providing direct services to youths, and three projects are focusing on improving the juvenile justice system through youth advocacy activities. The grants were awarded for two years, and it was projected that 12,000 youths would receive a variety of services under these highly individualized projects. Examples of the types of services offered include tutoring, alternative education, peer counseling, job training and placement, recreation, and crisis intervention. At the close of 1981 more than 11,000 youths had participated in the 15 projects—nearly twice the number originally projected.

The capacity building awards were staggered between October 1980 and January 1981. Overall, the individual grants are meeting their stated objectives within the appointed periods. The projects are now in their second year of operation, and it is anticipated that the stated goals and objectives will be attained during the approved project periods. No funds are projected beyond the original awards.

Coordinating Council

The Coordinating Council, as statutorily required, has been meeting on a quarterly basis. The Council is engaged in activities involving Native American youth, the detention of youth by other Federal agencies, and the development of the Sixth Analysis and Evaluation. In addition, the Office in conjunction with the Council has entered into an Interagency Agreement with the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to hold two forums with State and local officials on how the Federal government can reduce barriers and streamline regulations pertaining to youth programming. The Office, as part of its Concentration of Federal Effort

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

mandate and in conjunction with the Department of Labor, has just completed funding 14 projects under the Model Comprehensive Programs for High-Risk Youth. These projects are designed to show that barriers to effective comprehensive programming can be reduced and eliminated and that there does not need to be a total reliance on Federal funds to develop programs for high-risk youth.

The Council's goal continues to be the coordination of youth programs to ensure their effective and efficient operation.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

APPENDIX

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

AREA AUDIT AND PROGRAM REVIEW OFFICES*

	Geographical Area of Responsibility
Charles F. Rinkevich, Director Atlanta Area Audit and Program Review Office U.S. Department of Justice 101 Marietta Towers, Suite 2322 Atlanta, Georgia 30303 404-221-5928 (FTS) 8-257-4978	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Puerto Rico, Tennessee, Virgin Islands
Robert C. Gruensfelder, Director Chicago Area Audit and Program Review Office U.S. Department of Justice Suite A-1335 175 W. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, Illinois 60604 312-353-1203	Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan Minnesota, Ohio Nebraska, Kansas Missouri, Wisconsin
V. Allen Adams, Director Denver Area Audit and Program Review Office U.S. Department of Justice Post Office Box 3119 Denver, Colorado 80201 303-837-2501 (FTS) 8-327-2501	Arkansas, Colorado, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, Texas, Wyoming
Joseph L. Mulvey, Director Sacramento Area Audit and Program Review Office U.S. Department of Justice Post Office Box 3010, 801 I St. Sacramento, California 95812	Alaska, Arizona, Calif., Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, American Samoa, Washington, Guam, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Idaho
Charles K. Straub, Director Washington Area Audit and Program Review Office U.S. Department of Justice 5205 Leesburg Pike 1 Skyline Plaza, Suite 1600 Falls Church, Virginia 22041 703-756-6277 (FTS) 8-756-6277	Connecticut, Maine, Dist. of Columbia, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey, Vermont, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, W. Virginia, Virginia

**These offices have been transferred to the Justice Management Division, the administrative arm of the U.S. Department of Justice.*

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCILS

Alabama
Robert G. Davis, Director
Alabama Law Enforcement Planning Agency
2863 Fairlane Drive, Executive Park
Building F, Suite 49
Montgomery, Alabama 36116
Phone (205) 832-6830

Alaska
Charles Adams, Jr., Executive Director
Office of Justice Assistance
Pouch KJ
Juneau, Alaska 99811
Phone (907) 465-3535

American Samoa
La'avli A. Filoiali'i, Acting Director
Criminal Justice Planning Agency
Government of American Samoa
P.O. Box 3760
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799
Phone Pago Pago 633-5221 (Overseas Operator)

Arizona
Larry Landry, Executive Director
Office of Economic Planning & Development
State Capitol
1700 W. Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Phone (602) 255-5004

Arkansas
Mary Ellen Henderson, Grant Administrator
Administrative Services Division
Department of Finance and Administration
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203
Phone (501) 371-1771

California
Douglas R. Cunningham, Executive Director
Office of Criminal Justice Planning
Suite 600
9719 Lincoln Village Drive
Sacramento, California 95827
Phone (916) 336-5304

Colorado
James Vetter, Associate Director for
Criminal Justice Affairs
Department of Local Affairs
1313 Sherman Street
Room 419
Denver, Colorado 80203
Phone (303) 866-4908

Connecticut
William H. Carbone, Executive Director
Connecticut Justice Commission
75 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06115
Phone (203) 566-3020

Delaware
Thomas J. Quinn
Criminal Justice Planning Section
Office of Management, Budget & Planning
State Office Bldg.
820 North French St.
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
Phone (302) 571-3431

District of Columbia
Shirley Wilson, Executive Director
Office of Criminal Justice Plans and Analysis
421 8th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
Phone (202) 727-6554

Florida
Joyce D. Peterside, Bureau Chief
Bureau of Criminal Justice Assistance
2571 Executive Center Circle East
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Phone (904) 488-6001

Georgia
Chantal R. Akridge, Director
Grants Management & Audit Section
Georgia Department of Community Affairs
40 Marietta St., N.W., 9th Floor
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
Phone (404) 656-1725, 1726, 1727

Guam
Angel A. R. Sabian, Acting Executive Director
Guam Criminal Justice Planning Agency
Government of Guam, P.O. Box 2950
Agana, Guam 96910
Phone Guam 472-8781 (Overseas Operator)

Hawaii
Irwin Tanaka, Director
State Law Enforcement Planning Agency
250 South King Street, Room 412
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Phone (808) 548-3800

Idaho
L. G. Hopkins, Director
Department of Law Enforcement
Law Enforcement Assistance Division
6058 Corporal Lane
Boise, Idaho 83704
Phone (208) 334-2364

Illinois
William W. Holland, Acting Executive Director
Illinois Law Enforcement Commission
120 South Riverside Plaza, 10th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone (312) 454-1560

Indiana
Rosco Walters, Acting Executive Director
Indiana Criminal Justice Planning Agency
215-17 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202
Phone (317) 232-1251

Iowa
Richard E. George, Executive Director
Iowa Crime Commission
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Phone (515) 281-3241

Kansas
David W. P. O'Brien, Director
Governor's Committee on Criminal Administration
503 Kansas Avenue, Second Floor
Topeka, Kansas 66603
Phone (913) 296-3066

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Kentucky
John R. Lancaster, Director
Division for Grant Programs
Kentucky Dept. of Justice
State Office Building Annex, lst Floor
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Phone (502) 564-3251

Louisiana
Elmer B. Litchfield, Executive Director
Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement
Administration of Criminal Justice
1885 Wooddale Boulevard, Room 615
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806
Phone (504) 925-4418

Maine
Richard E. Perkins, Executive Director
Maine Criminal Justice Planning and Assistance Agency
4 Wabon Street
Augusta, Maine 04330
Phone (207) 289-3361

Maryland
Richard W. Friedman, Executive Director
Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice
One Investment Place, Suite 700
Towson, Maryland 21204
Phone (301) 321-3631

Massachusetts
Walter Timilty, Acting Director
Committee on Criminal Justice
100 Cambridge St.
Room 2100
Boston, Massachusetts 02202
Phone (617) 727-6300

Michigan
Charles R. Davoli, Executive Director
Office of Criminal Justice Programs
Lewis Cass Building, Second Floor
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Phone (517) 373-6655

Minnesota
Michael J. McMahon, Program Director
Minnesota Crime Control Planning Board
444 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Phone (612) 296-3113

Mississippi
Roy Thigpen, Director
Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Planning
Ike Sanford Building, 2nd Floor
637 North President St.
Jackson, Mississippi 39201
Phone (601) 354-6041

Missouri
Edward Daniel, Director
Department of Public Safety
621 East Capitol - P.O. Box 1041
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
Phone (314) 751-4905

Montana
Michael Lavin, Administrator
Montana Board of Crime Control
303 North Roberts
Helena, Montana 59601
Phone (406) 449-3604

Nebraska
Robert L. Tagg, Executive Director
Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
301 Centennial Mall South, P.O. Box 94946
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509
Phone (402) 471-2194

Nevada
S. Barton Jacka, Director
Department of Motor Vehicles
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710
Phone (702) 885-4405

New Hampshire
Richard L. Bouley, Executive Director
New Hampshire Crime Commission
Pine Inn Plaza
117 Manchester St.
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
Phone (603) 271-3601

New Jersey
Harold Damon, Executive Director
New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency
Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex
CN083
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
Phone (609) 292-3741

New Mexico
Paul Shoemaker, Director
Planning and Program Development
Bureau, ASD
Corrections and Criminal Rehabilitation Department
113 Washington Avenue
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
Phone (505) 827-5222

New York
Marshall Richter, Administrator
State of New York
Division of Criminal Justice Services
80 Centre Street, Fourth Floor
New York, New York 10013
Phone (212) 488-4868

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

North Carolina
Gordon Smith, III, Executive Director
Governor's Crime Commission
N.C. Dept. of Crime Control and Public Safety
P.O. Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611
Phone (919) 733-4000

North Dakota
Michael Hill, Director
Training and Statistics Division
North Dakota Attorney General's Office
State Capitol
Bismark, North Dakota 58505
Phone (701) 224-2594

Northern Mariana Islands
Richard D. Shewman, Director
Northern Mariana Islands Criminal Justice
Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1133
Saipan, Mariana Islands 96950
Phone Overseas Operator 9351

Ohio
Bennett J. Cooper, Assistant Director
Ohio Department of Economic and Community
Development
Office of Criminal Justice Services
30 East Broad Street, 26th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Phone (614) 466-7610

Oklahoma
Cindy Rambo, Executive Director
Dept. of Economic and Community Affairs
4545 N. Lincoln, Suite 285
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105
Phone (405) 528-8200

Oregon
Keith Stubblefield, Administrator
Oregon Law Enforcement Council
2001 Front Street N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310
Phone (503) 378-4347

Pennsylvania
George F. Grode, Executive Director
Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency
P.O. Box 1167, Federal Square Station
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17108
Phone (717) 787-2040

Puerto Rico
Flavia Alfaro de Quevedo, Executive Director
Puerto Rico Crime Commission
GPO Box 1256
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00936
Phone (809) 783-0398

Rhode Island
W. Bradley Crowther, Acting Executive Director
Rhode Island Governor's Justice Commission
86 Weybosset Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
Phone (401) 277-2620

South Carolina
Bruce G. Dew, Director
Division of Public Safety Programs
Edgar A. Brown State Office Building
1205 Pendleton Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Phone (803) 758-3573

South Dakota
Rod Anderson, Acting Director
Division of Law Enforcement Assistance
118 West Capitol
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
Phone (605) 773-3665

Tennessee
Stephen H. Norris, Executive Director
Tennessee State Planning Agency
16th Floor, James K. Polk Bldg.
505 Deadrick St.
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
Phone (615) 741-3521

Texas
David Herndon, Executive Director
Governor's Office of General Counsel and
Criminal Justice
Capital Station
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711
Phone (512) 475-3001

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
Kent Harvey, Acting Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands
Saipan, Mariana Islands 96950
Phone Overseas Operator 9351

Utah
Hazen Locke, Director
Utah Council on Criminal Justice Administration
255 South Third Street-East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Phone (801) 533-5731

Vermont
Molly K. Corrigan, Executive Director
Vermont Commission on the Administration of Justice
13 Baldwin Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602
Phone (802) 828-2351

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Virgin Islands
Glenn Tobey, Acting Administrator
Virgin Islands Law Enforcement
Planning Commission
Box 3807
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801
Phone (809) 774-6400

Virginia
Richard N. Harris, Director
Division of Justice and Crime Prevention
805 East Broad St.
Richmond, Virginia 23219
Phone (804) 786-4000

Washington
Frank Glaspey, Program Administration Manager
Division of Accounting & Fiscal Services
Office of Financial Management
Mail Stop ER 13
400 E. Union
Olympia, Washington 98504
Phone (206) 754-2802

West Virginia
Patrick Gallagher, Executive Director
Governor's Committee on Crime, Delinquency and Corrections
5790-A MacCorkle Avenue, S.E.
Charleston, West Va. 25304
Phone (304) 348-8814

Wisconsin
John H. Givens, Executive Director
Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice
30 West Mifflin St.
10th Floor, Suite 1000
Madison, Wisconsin 53702
Phone (608) 266-7648

Wyoming
William Penn, Administrator
Wyoming Attorney General's Planning
Committee on Criminal Administration
720 West 18th Street
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
Phone (307) 777-7716